CANADA AND HER COLONIES

OR

HOME RULE FOR ALBERTA

A. BRAMLEY-MOORE

A-312

L. H. Thomas

CANADA AND HER COLONIES

CANADA AND HER COLONIES

OR

HOME RULE FOR ALBERTA

BY

A. BRAMLEY-MOORE

W. STEWART & CO.

LONDON, E.C.

1911

HC
M8198ca
596267
8.11.54

Copyright Reserved

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	The Genesis of Alberta	1
II.	Alberta's Status as a Canadian Colony	8
III.	Review of Colonial Systems	20
IV.	Colonial History of Canada	31
V.	Alberta's Political Constitution	39
VI.	Representation	50
VII.	Factors Determining Size of Countries	61
VIII.	The Tariff	75
IX.	Financial Position of Alberta	86
X.	Lands as a Needed Source of Revenue	100
XI.	Spoliation of Western Lands by Dominion	111
XII.	Immigration	123
XIII.	Alberta's Coal and Timber Resources	132
XIV.	Possible Ways of Obtaining Redress of Grievances	142
XV.	Political Summary	152
XVI.	Philosophical Summary	166
XVII.	Conclusion	176

PREFACE

A FEW remarks may not be out of place in explanation of the reasons which stirred me to write this book.

As a member of the Alberta Legislature I could not fail from being deeply influenced by witnessing the total overthrow of the Rutherford government on account of their efforts to open up the northern portions of the province.

Nothing could have more forcibly brought home to my mind the injustice of a state of affairs by which a Provincial Government assumes the liabilities incident to the development of a vast country while the natural resources of that country are owned and controlled by a foreign Government. The province undertook to assist in the construction of a railroad into regions where every square inch of land, every stick of timber,

every pound of mineral belonged to the Dominion Government.

That the proper provincial attitude under such conditions consisted in a policy of *laissez-faire* I could not credit. The citizens of Alberta may be supposed to possess more than the average spirit of enterprise, as evidenced by their colonization of Alberta. Was it to be considered that this spirit of enterprise should cease to exert itself? Were the citizens of Alberta to regard the larger portions of their province as something foreign, as something taboo, as something calling for the display of powers beyond their strength?

Such a view of affairs does not appeal to me, nor do I think it is a view agreeable to Alberta. Having attempted and failed in our first endeavour, it behoved us to analyse the causes which produced the failure and then to find a remedy.

My own conclusion is that the provincial constitution is too limited, and that the province must own her own natural resources, be they lands, minerals or timber. In the

following pages I have set forth the arguments which appear to me to justify our provincial ambitions. I have endeavoured to treat the matter on a non-partisan basis, which has been made easier from the fact that the late political crisis in Alberta has almost eliminated parties.

If I have succeeded in stimulating some minds to feel an interest in these subjects, and to pursue them further, my object will have been attained. The humblest instrument often plays an important part by being the stimulus necessary to arouse dormant energies. Alberta is a province to be proud of. She need fear no comparison with any other country as far as natural wealth goes. That she also need fear no comparison in the matter of the spirit and enterprise of her citizens is my firm conviction, and a nation endowed with such qualities will never for any length of time endure a curtailment of national rights incompatible with a proper self-respect.

A. B.-M.

624 Hardisty Avenue,
Edmonton.

CANADA AND HER COLONIES

CHAPTER I

THE GENESIS OF ALBERTA

LITTLE did Prince Rupert dream, when he consented to become the patron of a band of adventurers desirous of exploring and trading in the northern wilds of America, that this action would entitle him to his country's lasting gratitude. Those dashing cavalry charges, so associated with his name, were sterile of permanent results; his patronage of the company of Gentleman Adventurers was pregnant with the future fate of a country large enough to be styled an Empire.

If Columbus had found a patron in England we can surmise that South and Central

America would not have so completely fallen under Spanish influence, and we may with equal reason conjecture that England became the paramount power in the regions adjacent to Hudson's Bay thanks to Prince Rupert's action. Prince Rupert, we feel safe in stating, neither intended nor foresaw the epoch-making consequences of this event in his life; he probably regarded it but as an incident, and an insignificant incident at that. But, as is the case in so many instances, he laboured better than he knew, and his name will ever be associated with that vast country lying to the west of the Hudson's Bay.

This company of adventurers, so well known as the Hudson's Bay Company, of which Prince Rupert was the first patron, obtained a charter in 1670 granting it a monopoly of the trade of those regions. We will not investigate the fortunes which befell the Company during the lengthy period of its ascendancy, but will content ourselves with noting the fact that they formed the necessary link which perpetu-

ated British suzerainty during the troublous times of the eighteenth century.

After the Canadian provinces had framed their Confederation they cast their eyes upon this vast domain still almost entirely tributary to the Hudson's Bay Company. With this object in view Canada approached the British authorities at home, where she had no difficulty in convincing the British Government that she would be a gainer by transferring these territories to Canada. Great Britain, when she handed them over to Canada, stipulated that a settlement should be made with the Hudson's Bay Company to extinguish their real or imaginary claims, that the Indians should be protected and law and order maintained.

Canada undertook these obligations. The Hudson's Bay Company's title and interest in the country were bought for the sum of a million and a half dollars together with a grant of one-twentieth of the land. During the negotiations a rebellion broke out in Manitoba in 1869, which was put down by Sir Garnet Wolseley. Later, in 1885, there

was a second rebellion, owing to the apprehensions of the breeds and Indians that their lands and hunting-grounds were going to be taken from them. The rebellion did not attain large dimensions and was speedily quelled. The leader, Louis Riel, after whom the Rebellion is named, was hanged, and since that date nothing has disturbed the peace of the country.

The most important event during this epoch was the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which connected the Atlantic with the Pacific Oceans. This railway was completed in 1885, which must be regarded as the date which closes the earlier historical period when these territories were the haunts of trappers, Indians and buffaloes.

The development of the country for the first few years after the completion of the Canadian Pacific was not rapid.

Many causes combined to bring about this partial stagnation. The railway had followed the southern route, which traversed huge areas which were considered to be part

of a dry belt; the freight charges were enormously high; the United States had not yet filled up their own western states, and last, but not least, the development of any new country starts gradually as easy communication is necessary to establish large industries, be they agricultural or manufacturing, and easy communication is hard to obtain until a large trade has been developed. The two factors form an endless chain; both are contingent to a certain extent on the existence of the other, and as a result initial development is a gradual process awaiting each hesitating step of the capitalists who are needed to establish lines of communication.

Little by little Western Canada's lines of communication became more and more extended, and with their increase the commercial and agricultural interests evolved from a state of haphazard, spasmodic activity into continuous and regular channels no longer materially disturbed by every passing wave of prosperity or adversity. No definite date can be assigned to

this transition from the irresponsibility of the pioneer stage to the more sober and staid position of an active participant in the world's commercial life; but we may roughly regard 1900 as the date on which started the present phase of Western Canada's history.

When Canada took over the stewardship of these territories there was first formed the province of Manitoba with a local legislature. For the administration of the districts comprising Saskatchewan, Alberta and Assiniboia a modified system of a representative assembly was put in force. This assembly had very little power. It received remittances from the Dominion Government, with which it constructed roads and bridges and undertook other works necessary even in a pioneer country.

By 1905 the population had increased so enormously that the Dominion saw fit to meet the demands of these districts for the establishment of fuller and freer local autonomy.

As a consequence the Dominion Govern-

ment, by virtue of the powers granted them by the British North America Act, created two new provinces—Alberta and Saskatchewan. Together they comprise the old districts of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Assiniboia and Athabasca.

By their formation as provinces they became, or rather should have become, partners in the Confederation of Canada.

The purpose of this book is to investigate the deficiencies in the constitutions granted these new provinces, and to question the justice and advisability of such curtailments of their local autonomy.

CHAPTER II

ALBERTA'S STATUS AS A CANADIAN COLONY

THE title of this book refers to Canada as being possessed of colonies and consequently as having pursued a certain course of colonial policy; this may be somewhat of a surprise to many who have still hardly ceased regarding Canada as a colony herself, and yet when we look beneath the veneer on the surface we will find that the statement is indisputably true, and that Canada not only possesses colonies but very large and prosperous colonies at that. That this fact should have escaped notice is not really surprising, as one of the most marked characteristics of mankind is an extreme aversion to close and searching analysis of things accepted; the majority habitually regard with disfavour those who undertake

to analyse the prevailing religious beliefs, political nostrums or social doctrines. It acts as a shock suddenly to discover that the previous castles of their fancies were merely built on shifting sand, and that at the first attack of the analyst all their treasured ideas and opinions are shown to be valueless. We are accustomed to read of old-world dynasties spending their energies in attempts to acquire increased territory; we feel righteously indignant at the conduct of those countries who imagined they had the right to skim the cream off such colonies as they might have founded, and we piously thank God that we live in a more enlightened age, when such occurrences would on no account be permitted.

Consequently no wonder it comes as a surprise to learn that not only does Canada possess what we may call a colonial Empire, but also that in dealing with her colonies the policy pursued by Canada is very little different to that pursued by England a hundred years ago, or to that pursued continuously and disastrously by Spain.

That this is really the case the succeeding chapters will essay to prove; the present chapter will make a hasty review of the political birth of modern Canada.

The Dominion of Canada came into existence in 1867 through the Confederation of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Previous to this date the various provinces had conducted their own affairs under the supervision of Downing Street.

For forty years or more Ontario and Quebec, or Upper and Lower Canada as they were then called, had been a source of worry to the Home Government, and the idea of a Confederation was eagerly hailed by Downing Street as an expedient which might put an end to those complications engendered in the herculean task of making a Government agreeable alike to the English-speaking and French-speaking citizen.

The scheme of Confederation was matured and each province was then asked to pronounce upon it.

It was a voluntary union; each province was asked to say "Yes" or "No," though it

is true that in the case of Nova Scotia some very questionable tactics were used by the Crown authorities to get her assent, and it was many years before Nova Scotia became completely reconciled to her absorption in the Union. Still the principle was that the union was voluntary. Previous to this union each province had certain rights of their own. Before they entered into it they knew exactly what special prerogatives they would have to hand over to the Central Government, and were able to insist on such powers being retained by the Provincial parliaments as they may have deemed necessary for a continuance of that measure of local autonomy desired by each respective unit. Naturally there were grave disagreements as to what powers should be kept and what given away by the provinces; and naturally it was the smaller provinces, such as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who were the more particularly jealous lest by sacrificing their local independence to too great an extent they should eventually lose their individuality and

become merely appendages to the larger provinces.

The prime mover of the negotiations was Sir John Macdonald, and it must be noted that he was heart and soul in favour of a legislative rather than a federal union, and the final result arrived at must be regarded as a compromise between the two extremes.

For instance, the union of the British Isles is a legislative union; the union of the Canadian Provinces was not legislative entirely such as the British Isles, nor yet was it framed on such a broad federal basis as the American Union.

However, the hypothesis of the original Confederation, whether it was actually confirmed or not, was voluntary consent by the parties affected.

Likewise, when Prince Edward Island and British Columbia joined it was also by voluntary consent; they were already in enjoyment of full provincial autonomy, and when they agreed to hand over certain of their powers to the Central Government, it was on the assumption that the benefits they

would gain would more than counterbalance the advantages of entire local independence.

Canada had now come into existence formed by a union of consenting individual units; each having agreed, for the supposed general good, to certain curtailments of their own individual powers, but still retaining sufficient prerogatives as would preserve a self-respecting measure of local autonomy.

The fact of such friction having been aroused on the question as to how far the union should be legislative as opposed to federal,—and more than once it seemed as though the whole scheme would fall to the ground so antagonistic were the views held, —this fact must always be closely borne in mind, as in this original union the four provinces were comparatively close geographically, and if serious objections were taken by them to the delegation of too much authority to the Central Government, how much greater would be the objections of other units at a greater distance from the seat of Government. As we saw in the last chapter

the North-West Territories were handed over to Canada by Great Britain in 1870.

Great Britain was not impressed with their importance or value, and was still under the influence of the Manchester school of politicians, a school which considered the possession of colonies as a doubtful benefit, and especially these colonies adjacent to the United States. Canada was allowed by Great Britain to purchase these territories; Great Britain waived her rights, which were indisputable, in favour of Canada.

These territories were transferred by their mother-country to a new guardian, who promised to take the place of their mother. But, unfortunately, the expenses, small though they were, incurred by the purchase and administration of these territories made Canada lose sight of the fact that her own parentage was no better than their parentage, and she gradually came to regard them as lands acquired by herself as a speculation or an investment; or, when this view was absent, she looked upon herself as a veritable fairy godmother heaping priceless

treasures on some lucky orphan. Thus we see that these Canadian views unconsciously had the effect of making these new territories treated as colonies.

It has not been the custom of historians to designate these acquisitions as colonies, but what else can they be regarded as other than Canadian colonies.

We use the word " colonies " in its generally-accepted sense, *i.e.*, a foreign possession; or perhaps a better definition would be that a colony is a term applied to such extensions of extraneous territory acquired by a country for the purpose of Empire or trade.

It must be admitted that the North-West Territories became Canadian possessions, and as the Interpretation Act of 1889 defined a colony as any part of the British Dominions exclusive of the British Isles or British India, it would seem perfectly in harmony with truth to claim that these Canadian possessions must be classed as colonies.

This may appear quibbling; on the con-

trary, it is of the utmost importance to define the status of these territories thus obtained by Canada.

There has always existed a hazy idea that Canada herself being a British possession, it necessarily followed that there was no differentiation in the status possessed by the various parts of Canada, and it is this mistaken idea we desire to dispel. We have already seen how four self-governing units formed of their own free will a Confederation; the North-West Territories did not join of their own free will. So far was that from being the case that a rebellion actually occurred when the news of the cession to Canada became known, and at a later date the Riel rebellion would again give colour to the statement that in seizing these territories Canada was merely following in the footsteps of her own mother-country in the acquirement of foreign possessions which might be useful in the future for purposes of expansion or trade.

However, without laying much stress on the mild rebellions, let us bear in mind that

colonies are acquired by purchase, by war, or, if uninhabited by a so-called civilised community, by claiming the country in the name of the explorer's sovereign or Government by the simple process of raising a flag Most of Africa has been obtained by various countries in the last-named manner; but now no more opportunities are open, and outside of war it is necessary to purchase if a colony is desired.

Canada purchased her colonies by a payment to Hudson's Bay Company; to a certain extent she obtained them by war, when we consider Wolseley's expedition in 1869 and Riel's rebellion in 1885; and originally we can fairly presume that large portions of these territories became British possessions because they claimed them.

Thus we see all the conditions were partially complied with, and it is clear that Canada, unconsciously it is true, started the foundations of a colonial Empire when she purchased the North-West Territories. Because such stress has been laid upon the fact that these possessions must be regarded

as colonies, it must not be hastily inferred that a stigma attaches to the acquisition of colonies. By no means; colonies are most necessary, and Canada's action in acquiring these possessions, before she really knew if her own Confederation would survive the perils that then threatened its existence, is a proof of indomitable enterprise and optimism. But for our purpose of endeavouring to understand the status of the various parts which go to make up Canada, it is absolutely essential at the outset to make this point very clear, that while the other parts of Canada are partners in a Confederation, the North-West Territories are not partners, but are territories owned by the union of other provinces.

Later, in 1871, British Columbia joined the Confederation; she made her own terms, and entered the Confederation on an equal status with the original four provinces.

In 1872 Prince Edward Island likewise entered into Confederation; she had previously on two or three occasions refused, but at last, on more advantageous terms

being offered, she consented to become part of the Confederation. Thus we see that all the units comprising the Confederation of Canada voluntarily entered into a partnership with the exception of the North-West Territories.

The original units had already a political existence; they were alive, so to speak, and could, and did, act for themselves. The North-West Territories had no political existence; but to-day they, too, are alive, and it is our intention to investigate the treatment accorded to them when it became necessary to grant them a political individuality.

Recognising that all knowledge is relative, a proper understanding of their original status in the Dominion of Canada is imperative, and that status we regard as being one of a colony.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF COLONIAL SYSTEMS

NOW that we have settled the status of the North-West Territories as being that of colonies, it will be necessary to glance through the records of history and learn what we can about the various policies which have been made use of by different countries in the administration of colonies.

A careful study and proper appreciation of the results of lines of colonial policy as exhibited in history should enable us to avoid past mistakes and to initiate a colonial policy more in conformity with the rights of both the regulated and regulative. Of course, allowance must be made for changed conditions, and perhaps this is a fitting place to point out the sometimes forgotten truth, that this is a new age with new customs, new ideas and a new code of political morality.

The change may not be lasting. In the eternal rhythm accompanying all life there may be a sudden revulsion to the old predatory habits of our ancestors, but whatever may be the final outcome, at present unprovoked aggression on weaker neighbours is regarded as immoral. Unprovoked aggression occurs occasionally, but when it does the aggressor feels it necessary in compliance to the prevailing public opinion to disguise the actual facts by speciously alleging that it is only in the interest of the attacked that she feels compelled to engage in a task she heartily dislikes! While we may detect the spurious altruism, and rather regard it as veiled hypocrisy, yet the very fact of the aggressor feeling it necessary to make excuses is a proof of prevailing sentiment. And that there is such a prevailing sentiment will be more readily believed when we see that it has arisen as a natural result of increased industrialism. If the growth of industrialism proceeds unchecked, we may look for an increased ratio of immunity from the aggressions of the

strong over the weak; and correspondingly we may effect changes in our political regime to suit the new conditions.

From these remarks it follows that there is even less excuse to-day than there was formerly, when militarism was rampant, for an undue subjection of colonies to the mother-country, and that actions rightly considered as tyrannical a century ago would be doubly more criminal to-day.

The Mediterranean Sea was the cradle of Western civilisation, and it is on its shores that we first discover a country engaged in maritime colonization.

The Phœnicians are the earliest maritime colonizers historically known to us. Their colonies were trading posts established for commercial reasons solely; they were not regarded as forming part of a Phœnician Empire, and each colony grew up independent and shaped its own destiny. From our standpoint more interest attaches to the study of the colonial enterprises of Ancient Greece, a country in which, combined with

the Phœnician commercial spirit, existed an equally strong political spirit.

Strange to relate, our modern ideal of colonial autonomy forms the type peculiar to Greek colonies. A Greek colony was a politically independent community united to the mother-country by ties of sentiment and religion. Here again we note the inseparable connection of industrialism with free institutions; for the Greek colonies were essentially trading and not military outposts, and in their character as traders they unconsciously adopted that free form of government consistent with the principles of industrialism as opposed to militancy.

The connection is even more apparent when we reflect on the loss of self-government suffered by these colonies on the growth of militancy owing to the Persian Wars. Unwillingly embroiled in a defensive warfare, still the very participation in active militancy produced an inevitable change, and instead of a Confederation of self-governing colonies there resulted an Athenian Empire.

Just as we would have been led to expect by the relations above set forth as existing between industrialism and militancy and certain forms of government, we find that the colonies of Rome, a nation notoriously given to militancy whether as a Republic or Empire, were never possessed of even a germ of self-government, but were always administered by some official sent directly from Rome. To the Roman mind a colony was a possession belonging to the State, just as much as a new estate would belong to its purchaser; and just as a purchaser of an estate would regard himself as perfectly justified in exploiting its resources for his own personal benefit, similarly Rome considered her colonies as estates to be exploited for the advantage of their owners.

While this view is correct, referring to such possessions called in our loose phraseology Roman colonies, yet we must modify our remarks by the explanation that whereas a Greek colony was formed of emigrants from Greece, a Roman colony was peopled more by the conquered nation than by Romans,

and would probably be more rightly classed as a province, a word which means a conquered country.

However, as is easily perceived, the word colony came to be applied not only to foreign lands settled by emigrants from the home-country, but also to such possessions as, having a large indigenous population, are administered by a comparatively small force of alien officials, military and commercial.

The Christian era till after the commencement of the eighteenth century was an era of active militancy, and, as to be expected, colonies were administered under the Roman plan on the assumption that they were estates to be exploited.

Without endeavouring to notice the fortunes of every colonial Empire, we will be content to glance at the histories of the British and Spanish colonial Empires. Britain more than any other country possesses colonies in the proper sense of the word, *i.e.*, comparatively uninhabited territories settled by emigrants from the home-country.

For our purpose a review of British colonial policy as affecting their American colonies will be sufficient.

Obviously the outstanding feature is the revolt of the American colonies. Britain, with a fair amount of reason, thought the colonies should contribute towards the expenses incurred by her wars; it looked reasonable to assume that in those militant days the colonies would soon fall a prey to some aggressive Power if it were not for Britain's continual activity; but the colonists thought otherwise, and a cry was raised, "No taxes without representation"; and the resulting revolution has always been regarded as the heroic refusal of democracy to submit to arbitrary monarchical tyranny.

Probably the causes which eventually produced the revolution had silently been at work for years, and the apparent actual cause was but the accidental spark which kindled into action passions and prejudices which existed previously though of their existence people were unconscious.

It is hardly possible for an isolated griev-

ance to engender war; a previous antagonism must first have prepared the minds of people to enable them to reach that pitch of unthinking enthusiasm or suspicious animosity sufficient to make them welcome war. So much is this truth recognised that ingenious or unscrupulous men often contrive to " manufacture " sparks which may start some desired conflagration. Whereas in some cases these sparks are artificially created, in the case of the American secession it was an accidental spark which brought into play forces previously hidden.

For instance, it is hard to reconcile the puritanical republicanism of those cruel and unsocial New English settlers with loyalty to the English Court. What tales of the ungodly ways of Charles II. must have insulted their austerity; what a shock to their ignorant bigotry must have been the fact of a Catholic King, James II., and while the Rebellion of 1688 might be looked upon as a national vindication of Protestant principle, still for many years rumours of the possible success of the Pretenders must have crossed

the ocean. What loyalty could one expect these Puritans to have for the two early Georges? In a country where such episodes as that of Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* could happen, what must have been the opinion of a King who could say to his dying wife, who was urging him to marry again, "Non jamais, j'aurai des maîtresses."

All these reasons render it more likely that this American revolution was but the necessary separation of a people imbued with foreign religious, political and social ideals. Their religion, as does the religion of all dissenters, engendered rebellion, and that this was the underlying cause of the final separation is strikingly shown by the continued loyalty of the French-speaking Catholics in Canada in spite of many and grave grievances. But the Catholic religion instils the spirit of obedience to those in authority; and abuses have to multiply and become insupportable before rebellion arises. On the other hand, the crowning achievement of Puritanism was the successful rebellion against Charles I., and with this as a guide

to their conduct and an ever-living example in which they gloried it would not need a very great stimulus to arouse the latent discontent at being subordinate to a despised and hated Court.

These causes, if we are correct in assuming them to have been contributory causes to the final separation, were unconsciously at work, and as a matter of fact remained latent, and probably always would have remained so if it had not been for the conquest of Canada. So long as the French owned the neighbouring country, there was a very material reason for remaining under British protection, which vanished when Canada was ceded to Britain in 1759.

However, whatever may have been the actual cause, the ostensible reason alleged was that it was unconstitutional to tax people without their consent, and that as the colonists had no representation at London they could not be asked to pay taxes. In fact, the case was almost precisely similar to the complaints about the ship-money Charles I. attempted to raise;

and whereas many other reasons besides the ship-money combined to render the revolt against Charles so sustained and bitter, similarly other causes besides the one alleged conduced to increase the stubbornness and hostility of the colonists.

The result of the loss of the thirteen colonies inculcated at least one principle, namely: that people could not be taxed without such representation as implied the giving of their assent to the taxes by the voice of their delegates. That any other lesson was brought home to Britain by this disaster seems doubtful, as the colonial policy was by no means suddenly changed, and, as we shall find a little later on, the remaining colonies were still notoriously misgoverned and interfered with by Downing Street. Nations, like children, very quickly forget, and the eventual freedom granted by Britain to her colonies is more to be ascribed to the wonderful growth of industrialism which the nineteenth century witnessed; and, as noticed before, industrialism has as its correlative free institutions.

CHAPTER IV

COLONIAL HISTORY OF CANADA

IT is necessary to turn to Britain's dealings with Canada, and we will start with the Canada Act of 1791.

This Act may very properly be considered as an attempt to put the lessons taught by the American revolt into practice, but that it fell short of granting even a respectable measure of autonomy will soon appear. The principle it chiefly seems to put into practice is that the total revenue accruing from a colony must be spent in the colony, but only a slight recognition was given to the rights of the colonists to expend the revenue by means of their representatives. They were given a representative Parliament, but in practice it was worthless as the refusal to grant supplies could not frighten an executive council which had sole control

over the most important sources of revenue. For instance, in 1793, four-fifths of the revenue came from the Crown, one-fifth from the Parliament.

As stated in *Makers of Canada*, Vol. II., page 71, the constitution briefly summarized was as follows, viz.:

1. A colonial secretary in England who supervised the provincial Government.
2. A lieutenant-governor in the province who acted under an Imperial Commission and instructions.
3. An executive council appointed by the lieutenant-governor and responsible to him alone.
4. A legislative council composed of members appointed for life by the lieutenant-governor.
5. A legislative assembly elected by the people on a limited franchise, and exercising little control over the finances and government of the province.

Among other things, the Crown withdrew the right to taxation, except when it might be deemed necessary for the regulation of commerce, but in that event the monies raised were to be spent in the colony. The Crown disposed of Crown lands, timber on Crown lands, etc., without consulting the assembly, and likewise kept an untrammelled power of appointment.

This Bill created the celebrated "Clergy Reserves," consisting of one-seventh of the Crown lands to be set aside for the endowment of the Church of England, though eventually the Presbyterian claim to a share was admitted.

At the time this must have appeared a very liberal measure, especially as popular representation in the form we know it today was unknown, even in England; for in those days the House of Parliament was practically confined to a very limited class. But experience very soon made havoc with the expectations of the benefits it would confer. It remedied largely one evil, but created another in its place. While to a

very large extent exploitation of the colony by residents in England had been guarded against, the clauses constituting the irresponsible executive council and the non-elective legislative council insensibly created a local oligarchy of bureaucratic officials who soon inaugurated a system of pillage of the public resources and tyranny over obnoxious citizens more unendurable than a despotism. The representative assembly had no control over them, and the lieutenant-governor, a stranger coming to a strange country, finding the oligarchy in possession and constituting his legal advisers, very naturally fell into an alliance with them rather than with the troublesome assembly.

In Lord Durham's report in a reference to this official oligarchy he states " by grant or purchase they have acquired nearly the whole of the waste lands of the province."

Thus we see that the colonial policy was still unsatisfactory; for the sins of the official oligarchy the home Government was held responsible; the home Government had invented the system under which the evils

flourished; the colonists of themselves had no remedy except rebellion, and as a proof, if proof were needing, that the condition of affairs was intolerable a rebellion broke out in 1837.

The rebellion of 1837 aroused the home authorities, and Lord Durham was sent out as special commissioner to make a report. His report is famous, and may be regarded as the first real recognition of the necessity of granting full autonomy to distant colonies unless they are to be continually coerced by arms.

The result was the passing of the Union Act, 1840, which joined Upper and Lower Canada, and by it the system of executive responsibility to the representative assembly was inaugurated. It was some time before the principle became properly understood that even though Canada was a colony, yet her representative assembly was as much the sovereign power in matters under her jurisdiction as the British Parliament is in her sphere.

Since that time, and especially since Con-

federation, Britain has gradually abandoned prerogative after prerogative until it can safely be said to-day that Canada is a type of the old Greek colony; for she is a politically independent community united to the mother-country solely by ties of sentiment and religion.

Perhaps it is incorrect to say religion; religion with the Greeks was a real bond of union; to a certain extent it was with the Catholics in the Middle Ages; but Protestantism, even in its infancy, was but a poor bond of union.

The reader must have remarked the slow, gradual evolution of colonial autonomy; it has taken a hundred years to complete the gradual emancipation of colonies from the control of the mother-country; it has been a continual struggle, the mother-country sacrificing prerogative after prerogative to avoid friction; concessions were not voluntarily offered, and the resistance would probably have culminated in war if it had not been for that change of ideas nurtured by the new industrial spirit, a spirit which was

at its zenith in the middle of the last century.

Britain, imbued with industrialism, was able to grapple with and adapt herself to the ever-widening demands of colonies for full local autonomy; Spain, a nation characteristically militant, persisted in a policy of coercion and lost all her colonies.

It is not necessary to say much with regard to Spain. She treated her colonies as possessions; she expected to exploit them for her own good entirely, the welfare of the colony being entirely subsidiary.

A point of interest, and one which we will need to refer to later, is the policy by which her colonies had to admit Spanish goods free of duty, while a prohibitive duty was levied against the goods of other nations, and this more than any other cause impoverished and ruined the colonies.

The result was to be expected; revolution after revolution took place, till at last the United States acquired the remains of a once great colonial Empire.

Spain's loss of her colonies, Britain's loss

of the Union, and the almost superhuman efforts needed to coerce a few Boer farmers, should render it an axiom for the future that a nation of similar attainments situated at a distance cannot successfully be coerced.

CHAPTER V

ALBERTA'S POLITICAL CONSTITUTION

IN the last two chapters a digression has been made in order to place before the reader's mind a few of the salient historical and philosophical facts of the fortunes of previous colonial communities.

Regarding the North-West Territories as Canadian colonies, it was pertinent to this inquiry to study the colonial institutions of similarly-situated countries in order to form a groundwork on which to base our conclusions or criticisms.

Some of our most interesting data has been gathered from the annals of Canada herself; we have seen her gradual evolution from a colony entirely subject to home control to one in which there is practically no home control; in fact, though she now really corresponds in every particular to the constitution

of the Greek colony, still, considering the meaning implied when we use the word colony, it is almost a misnomer to term Canada a colony; she is to-day independent, with her own army, her own navy, her own tariffs, and the declaration of her Prime Minister that in time of war Canada would hold the right to call herself neutral.

Almost the only connecting link left is that the Privy Council is the last resort in important legal causes; when we consider the almost general desire of two litigants to have some outsider settle their disputes it is easily seen that this relic of ancient subserviency to the mother-country remains on account of its self-evident usefulness.

It has been pointed out that it took a century in which to produce these changes in her political constitution, and in order to impress firmly on the reader's mind the fact that the advantages accruing from the present form of self-government would have never been obtained if Canada had waited for a British statesman to give without being asked and pestered, let us quote the opinion

of J. A. Froude, Vol. II., p. 189 of his *Essays:*

"In Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Cape of Good Hope and elsewhere we possessed ourselves of territories as valuable as those which had separated from us. In these places, or some of them, so long as they would allow us, we continued to dispose of our convicts. Taught by experience, we avoided our past faults—we avoided them, that is, in the identical form for which we had paid so dearly, but so far as we dared we still administered their interests for our own convenience.

"We held their patronage, we disposed of their waste lands, we became involved in endless disputes with them, and this too came to an end. They refused to be demoralised by our felons; we kept them to ourselves. They claimed their lands; we abandoned them. They desired to fill their public offices with their own people; we parted with what had been an agreeable provision for younger brothers or political partisans. We surrendered all the privi-

leges which had been immediately profitable; and finally, to close all disputes, we left them to govern themselves in whatever way seemed good to them."

This extract portrays in an almost pathetic manner the unwilling surrender by the home authorities of such powers as rendered the colonies to some extent directly profitable to the mother-country.

Now let us return to the colonies possessed by Canada and learn something regarding their fortunes. The interests of these Western provinces or colonies have been and still are so indissolubly joined that when we trace the history of one we trace the history of both. For our purpose, therefore, except where the subject-matter necessitates a change of treatment, we will restrict our remarks to Alberta.

Before proceeding, let us again bear in mind that Alberta stands in the same relation to Canada as Canada stood to Britain a century ago. Canada had grievances, Britain was compelled to remedy them; should we find that Alberta has grievances,

it would appear reasonable that the same measure should be meted out to Alberta as was meted out to Canada.

Alberta was made a province in 1905; previous to that date the southern half of the province had been under the jurisdiction of the legislative assembly of the North-West Territories. The northern half of the province was unorganised.

This legislative assembly of the old territories had very incomplete powers; they were able to pass laws, but practically had no revenue except the funds doled out with due caution from Ottawa.

This assembly had sufficed for the needs of the country at that time; it was a vast country but sparsely settled, and as the larger portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway ran through the dry belt, settlement was very slow.

But in the early years of the twentieth century a change was brought about; railroads were encouraged and assisted in their construction through the more northerly districts, and a progressive immigration

policy was put into force with every success.

Consequently it was necessary to widen the local powers of administration, and with this intention the two new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were formed.

It can hardly be denied that similar powers and prerogatives as those possessed by the original units of Confederation would have been granted as a matter of course if the new provinces had been regarded as having the same status as the older provinces.

Being already owned by Canada it was not a question of obtaining their voluntary consent to become part of the Confederation; the question was what measure of local autonomy should be granted.

Already having a model to be guided by, *i.e.*, the constitutions in existence in the older provinces, one would have thought the new partners would have been granted similar constitutions; and so they would have been if they had been regarded as equal partners. On the contrary, Ottawa,

viewing these territories as colonies or possessions, did not grant them a constitution such as equity would approve, but one to suit herself.

Local autonomy in some form or other had to be granted; so, copying Britain's example, she grudgingly bestowed a measure of autonomy as limited as possible.

An elementary principle of local autonomy is control and administration of all such resources as are of purely local concern. This principle—and a principle too so strongly and vehemently insisted upon by Canada herself in the matter of her relations with Britain—this principle was openly violated.

The natural resources, including lands, timber, fisheries, coal, minerals, oil, tar-sands, water-powers, etc., were retained by the Dominion. It may be a moot point as to whether all these resources are of purely local concern, but most of them certainly are, and the arguments that all are of purely local concern are probably at least as forcible as the contrary arguments.

In lieu of the lands a special subsidy was granted, starting at $375,000 annually, till with growth of population it finally reaches a maximum of $1,125,000.

In a subsequent chapter we will deal more specifically with the terms of this so-called bargain; this chapter we will confine to a few general remarks. It has been customary to call these terms a bargain, as though there were two contracting parties, each having an equal say. This is absolutely opposed to truth and entirely misleading; there was no bargain made.

The old legislative assembly had on one or two occasions forwarded resolutions to Ottawa asking for autonomy, and on every occasion they demanded that the natural resources should be administered by the provinces. Western men were consulted, but being consulted does not make one a party to a bargain, especially when your advice is more often than not disregarded. Then it is argued that the people, by electing to their new local House a majority of Liberals who favoured the bill, thereby

agreed to the bill, and have consequently pledged themselves.

This is an equally absurd argument. When Canada accepted the Canada Act of 1791, did that pledge her for all time to abide by the terms of that Act? Would that Act be termed a bargain? Of course not. As each new Act was passed by Britain, Canada hoped it would remove her grievances; a fair-minded man generally considers any new scheme should have a fair trial. When it was discovered that grievances still existed, a fresh Act was demanded. Constitutionally, Britain had the right to do as she liked with Canada; Canada was her colony or possession, but Britain had learnt that theory does not always work out in practice, and that if abuses exist, or if the natural rights of separate communities are infringed, she must introduce remedial legislation herself, or lose her possessions.

Similarly with Alberta; a new constitution was granted; a great victory was won by the Liberal party, and they were the associates of the party who had framed the

constitution. But this action of the electorate confirmed nothing. They were willing to give it a trial. Accustomed to the bitter invectives and ferocity of party warfare, they expected denunciation of the bill. Most of them, comparative strangers in the country, were hardly prepared to pronounce upon the niceties of a constitution, and probably of more effect still was the fact that the only natural resource most of them had to do with was land, and that was being given away, so where were any grounds for complaints? But as the province grows older, so does a provincial nationality become more in evidence. The settlers, no longer strangers, take a steadily-increasing interest in everything; participation in elections creates a feeling of ownership in the province, and from these newly-aroused feelings is generated a discontent and dissatisfaction at the mutilated and disfigured constitution they have been granted.

Let us strongly combat the idea that a constitution of itself is sacred. Undue or incessant tinkering with a constitution is

not advisable, but the constitution we are dealing with is one that has arbitrarily been imposed upon a province by outsiders; and not only has the province been saddled with it by outsiders, but by outsiders who took good care not to saddle themselves with one similar. Legislators may frame paper constitutions, but unless they are framed to meet the practical rather than idealistic views of their age they will never survive.

The life of an organism is dependent upon its power of adapting itself to its environment; the life of a constitution is subject to similar restrictions, and we emphatically state that a narrow constitution has no greater likelihood of finding a suitable environment in Alberta than it found in the Upper Canada of last century.

CHAPTER VI

REPRESENTATION

GREAT stress has been laid upon the similarity of the Western provinces in their relations to Canada and those which previously existed between Canada and Britain. It has doubtless already occurred to the reader that one great difference has not been noted, in that, while Alberta has representation at Ottawa, Canada had none in England. That was the great cry of the seceding states: "*No taxes without representation.*" Alberta has representatives at Ottawa; they are there to protect her interests; one of her own men is actually the responsible head of the department which has the control of her natural resources; so in the light of those facts is it fair or just to accuse the Dominion of having treated Alberta as a stepmother would rather than as a mother?

Let us first glance back again at the colonial history of Canada. After the Act of 1791, although matters were continually referred to the Secretary of State in England for his decision, yet the government and administration were entirely in the hands of the colonists themselves; but, and this is the important point, they were in the hands of a colonial faction, disliked and distrusted by the majority. As Lord Durham's report informs us, there was carried on a scandalous system of family patronage in appointments, and of misappropriation of public lands by a favoured few; it happened, as a rule, not as an exception, that the bills passed by the legislative assembly were killed by the legislative council, which consisted of colonials. Consequently the grievances the colony suffered under were not actually inflicted by Britain, but resulted simply from the deficiencies of a bill which created a local bureaucratic officialdom independent and irresponsible to the people.

The principle of local autonomy was ap-

plied in so far as it was arranged that the spoils of the province belonged to local citizens; and resistance to any amelioration of conditions arose from the favoured local oligarchy, not from Britain. Such local autonomy was useless because of the irresponsibility of the executive to the people or their representatives.

Now Alberta, in spite of her representatives, has not the slightest control over the policy pursued by the Ottawa Government. Of what account are seven members among two hundred? Any influence they could exert would be infinitesimal. A $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. solution may be very efficacious in medical practice, but in the arena of the political conflict its effect is *nil*. Another point, illustrated by what we have just seen of Canada's experience of her official oligarchy, is that a Minister by necessity living two thousand miles away, naturally gravitates to, and becomes imbued with the ideas, sentiments, prejudices of the society he is thrown amongst. This is inevitable; he must lose touch with the local concerns, and

though he can be dismissed by the electors it will not be a remedy as constant changes will only throw the power more and more into the hands of the permanent civil servants, and a mild form of the Family Compact will be the result.

In short, it is impossible for any people to keep close watch on their representatives acting two thousand miles away, and as regards all matters of purely local concern, if the people are to have a voice in the settlement of the questions involved, the administration must be carried on by the local parliament.

Again there is the absurd complication of diverse interests. Alberta is deeply concerned with the administration of her local resources; it is not a petty parochial concern, but one of vital moment to her prosperity. At the same time let us instance the naval or tariff questions as examples; both of these questions are of more general importance.

Their solution will affect the entire country. The Albertan voter may be com-

pelled to sacrifice his convictions on local issues or *vice versa;* and it must be remembered his fellow-citizen in Ontario is in no such quandary, because his local concerns are managed by his local Government. Let us take a concrete example. The Liberal party claims to advocate Free Trade; a staunch Free Trader would object to vote against that principle, but at the same time this staunch Free Trader might be especially desirous to record a vote of censure against the Liberal party for a supposititious maladministration of Alberta's public domain. It is a case such as the above which goes to prove that personal individual responsibility of Ministers to the people becomes much impaired when a multitude of opposing issues are at stake.

We feel no hesitation in saying that it was owing to being placed in a position similar to the one above described which caused the results of those elections supposed to be confirmatory of the Autonomy Act.

The Western people as a whole were well satisfied with the Ottawa administration;

they had been progressive in opening up the country; they had probably been the actual cause of the presence in the country of most of the voters.

The question at stake had unfortunately been made a party issue. To express discontent with the Autonomy Act would have appeared as a vote of want of confidence *in toto*. With these conflicting interests to distract him, it was impossible for an elector to make his vote record his feelings on opposite questions.

Again, with regard to this question of representation, even though it follows that Alberta has a fractional voice in the administration of her affairs, what method of reasoning justifies two hundred odd Eastern members meddling and interfering with her local concerns when she is not permitted to meddle with their concerns? If their concerns were administered by the Central Government the small representation of the West would not at present influence the conduct of affairs, but at least the treatment of the two parts of Canada would be

similar, whereas at present it is illogical, absurd and unjust.

Such a state of affairs would not have arisen if Alberta had been regarded as a partner, which she has not been. Looked upon as a colony or possession, she has been treated as a colony, and this fact must be realized by Alberta; and then copying the example of earlier colonies, who originated and perfected the claims of colonies to full autonomy, such steps can be taken as may make it appear to the Ottawa authorities as the better part of valour to grant local freedom to Alberta.

All the above considerations would make it appear that representation is not of itself sufficient to allay cause for complaint as to deficiency of local powers. But combined with these reasons there is the definitely-stated opinion of the House of Commons at Ottawa that representation is not a cure for all grievances.

In 1882 the House of Commons at Ottawa passed a practically unanimous vote on certain resolutions recommending the Im-

perial Parliament to grant Home Rule to Ireland.

The resolutions were carried in the Senate by a vote of 36 to 6.

At a later date similar resolutions were again passed affording substantial evidence that the record of opinion in 1882 was not merely a chance whim, but was the expression of a permanent cherished belief.

This action on the part of Ottawa is a sufficient answer to the argument that as Alberta has representatives she has no wrongs to redress.

Ireland is not only represented in the Imperial Parliament, but it is notorious that in proportion to her population she is immensely over-represented. Yet Ottawa deliberately and decisively expresses the opinion that the Irish have a grievance; and it is necessary to attach the greatest weight to this statement of opinion, because unless the injustice in refusing to allow the Irish to administer their local concerns was palpably self-evident, it must not be supposed that the House of Commons, so jealous

of her own rights, would venture to interfere in a matter solely concerning the British Isles. Let us compare the two cases.

Distance from the capital of a country entails extra expense in travelling and prevents the members being in such close touch and sympathy with their constituents as is desirable.

Edmonton is, roughly, 2000 miles from Ottawa; Dublin, 300 from London.

In the matter of representation Ireland, as previously stated, is over-represented, while Alberta has only her fair share of representation.

Ireland has a voice in all English, Scottish and Welsh affairs; Alberta has no voice in the affairs of Quebec, Ontario and other provinces.

Ireland has no Crown lands, and can only be put to expense if she entered on a policy of sub-dividing and expropriating large estates, a policy which the Imperial Parliament has undertaken for her benefit. Alberta has millions of acres of Crown lands, but these are controlled and sold by

the Ottawa Government, and the proceeds spent as they see fit, and not necessarily spent to develop Alberta.

In short, if Ireland has a grievance there is no doubt about the validity of Alberta's grievance. During this last year Sir Wilfrid Laurier is reported as expressing surprise that Home Rule to Ireland is not granted.

Very little thought should convince Sir Wilfrid that Irish grievances stand on a far weaker footing than Albertan grievances. The Irish question is a legacy left to the present generation by their military ancestors; Irish wrongs originated from militancy, rendering the problem difficult of solution from the purely industrial point of view. In the case of Alberta there are no complications; Alberta belongs to the class of colonies of the industrial type; she is a colony after the style of a Phœnician colony, while Ireland was distinctly a colony of the Roman type. Ireland, accustomed to Roman colonial methods, might be considered as unlikely to adjust herself to a constitution based on the opposite principles of

industrialism. On the other hand, Alberta, a country industrial both in origin and growth, is equally unsuited to the application of principles only compatible with the ideals of militancy.

CHAPTER VII

FACTORS DETERMINING SIZE OF COUNTRIES

THERE is one more academic point we cannot afford to pass over. History is a science if properly viewed; the practice of being satisfied with the merest superficial understanding of a question is far too common, and we cannot too strongly urge the benefits to be derived from the closest analysis of essentials. Whether we agree or disagree with the conclusions arrived at, is a minor detail; importance attaches to extracting the true facts out of the mass of true and fictitious matter which surrounds most questions; then having, as best we may, stated what appears to be the truth each individual must draw his own conclusions.

Successfully to apply philosophical methods to the study of what relations

should exist between Alberta and Canada renders it necessary to understand what combination of circumstances is required to justify the existence of a separate country. Why is not either every village a separate community, or, on the other hand, why is not the whole world under one Government? Is it possible to find any rule for guidance in determining as to why certain portions of the earth should exist as separate individualities?

Passing over prehistoric times we may trace the development of communities, from the time when the family was the unit, through the various stages known as the hunting, nomadic, pastoral, agricultural and commercial. As an extension of family life the village arose and remained the political unit until considerable advances were made in agriculture and commerce. In course of time one village, by absorbing a neighbouring village, increased its dominions; this process would be continually repeated; and then there would be a rapid increase in the growth of these structures as the more

powerful aggressor would now be absorbing the smaller aggressor, which was itself a compound structure.

By this compounding and re-compounding were gradually formed units large enough to be styled kingdoms or empires. In remote places, difficult of access, this process of absorbing and being absorbed could not occur, and as a result the hill tribes of the Himalayas exist to-day, as they did centuries ago, as small, independent communities. Again, in the islands of the Pacific and elsewhere, this process of increase of structure was limited to the size of some island or some group of islands. Such physical causes continued to keep in check the indefinite growth of units previous to these days of marvellous inventions when neither mountains, seas nor deserts are longer formidable.

But in those regions of the world where passage from one district to another was easy, history records but the series of the rise and fall of empires; and so extraordinarily similar were their histories that the history of one is really the history of all.

Some may have left more enduring or more useful influences than others, but otherwise the history of all is a tale of growth, maturity, decay and death.

But not only do we notice this phenomenon of birth, growth, decay and death, but we find that the various nations of the world, as seen to-day, exhibit a variety of sizes—some are large, some are small, some are tending to increase, some are tending to diminish. We believe that all these results and tendencies are due to definite causes, and before we go further we feel that we must attempt to form some opinion as to what are these causes. The investigation is difficult, because the number of contributory causes is so great, and the net result of their effects so intermingled together that the disentanglement of even the main factors and their results appears like a Chinese puzzle.

Our point of inquiry then is, "What is the limit, if any, to the size of a nation?" and by a nation we understand a self-governing, independent community.

With almost a ceaseless monotony empires have arisen but to fall; can we discover some natural cause which will explain this perpetual disintegration of worldly empires? To our mind the main answer is that the laws of variation are responsible for the mutability of empires as well as for the mutability of species. In the organic world we know that variations have occurred; why they should have occurred is a problem still unsolved. However, without variations there would be stagnation, and it is essential for evolution that variations should appear. Spencer defines Evolution as indefinite, incoherent homogeneity merging into definite, coherent heterogeneity. To endeavour to simplify our terms, let us express our meaning by the word "sub-division"; everything appears to subdivide from a general indistinct mass into specific distinct parts. The plainest example is the world itself; originally gaseous matter, homogeneous, indefinite, incoherent; to-day look at the ingredients forming the world; the gaseous matter has sub-divided into earth,

air, water, etc.; things, as compared with the gaseous matter definite, coherent, heterogeneous. The same law is seen to apply in all parts of the animal kingdom; multitudes of relatively definite, coherent, heterogeneous species have sub-divided from some relatively homogeneous ancestral type. It is the same in inorganic as in organic life.

Does it not then seem that the same law applies to empires. They grow until they become huge, ill-defined, incoherent masses, from which they sub-divide into distinct, well-defined separate individualities. Is not the British Empire an example; but a few years ago a huge structureless body, now it has sub-divided into distinct, well-defined separate units. Makers of empires have always striven to unify as far as possible the laws, customs and manners of their subjects; they aimed at making their empires homogeneous; they all failed; progress necessitates heterogeneity; free play to variations is essential. A state of living death, such as China appears to exhibit, would be the result of the closest approach to homo-

geneity. The British Empire flourishes because it happens to be developed along the lines least resistant to free play of heterogeneity. Older empires, regarding heterogeneity as incompatible with unity, stood in the road of this the greatest principle in nature and perished in consequence. Fortunately all races will no more assimilate than will all chemicals; what a catastrophe if one inorganic matter commenced to assimilate all other inorganic matters? It was sub-division of elements which permitted our existence; it was sub-division of organic life which made us differentiate from other forms of organic life, so we may well believe that this great principle of sub-division is at work in other spheres of action as well.

A permanent homogeneity would mean stagnation, and life, evolution, progress all result from some irresistible natural tendency of homogeneous masses to split or subdivide into heterogeneous units.

As a result of this law the scientific basic principle of any large confederation would consist of a constitution by which free play

was ensured to the parts to evolve their own special heterogeneity or individuality; a constitution framed with the idea of welding a huge aggregate of peoples into one homogeneous whole would be contrary to what we are taught to expect by science, and a country so organised would either finally burst its bonds and return to heterogeneity, or would exist in a state of stagnation resembling death.

A scientific and philosophical diagnosis leads us to believe that attempts to combine together various aggregates on too vast a scale by a system of assimilation into one national ideal, must end in failure. It remains to be seen what course will conform the most closely to these natural tendencies of integration and disintegration.

For a scientific and natural division of the world into individual units, the following are the most important considerations to be borne in mind:

(1) Racial affinities.
(2) Geographical conditions.
(3) Identical interests.

(1) Every race has its own particular genius, and in an ideal condition of affairs each distinct race would be free to govern itself to suit its own taste.

This natural desire of racial freedom and individuality has found too many expressions in history to make it necessary to deal with it at length.

Portugal is a good example, because while geographically one would expect the entire peninsula to be under one Government, yet Portugal remains a separate country for racial reasons. Again, to the outsider who is accustomed to classify Norwegians and Swedes as Scandinavians, the separation of Norway from Sweden is even a more striking instance of how small a variation in racial affinity leads to separation.

In times of militancy, if a race is unable to defend its individuality it is merged into the dominions of some powerful aggressor; in times when the influence of industrialism is more potent, small races have less to fear from the coercion of powerful neighbours. In days when militancy was the ideal, the

secession of Norway from Sweden would have resulted in war; to-day, although militancy is still alive, yet the spirit of industrialism has a greater influence in moulding public opinion, and the idea of a war for the purpose of forcing a race into an unwilling union is abhorrent.

(2) Geographical conditions must be taken into account in deciding what forms a scientific limit to the size of specific units.

The hill tribes of the Himalayas are geographical units; Switzerland is also an example; she remains independent on account of geographical conditions. On the other hand, the Boers, not strong enough to maintain their racial independence against their powerful neighbour, became absorbed owing to geographical conditions. If the Transvaal had been an island she would have been left in peace, anyway in these days. Holland and Belgium are geographical parts of Germany, and would doubtless be annexed if it were not for the artificial protection afforded by allies. Ireland clamours for Home Rule on account

of the physical fact of being an island; that the agitation is racial seems of doubtful truth, as neither Scotland nor Wales ever originated similar agitations; any scheme of general Home Rule all round is merely the result of the Irish agitation, not owing to spontaneous or indigenous growth.

The Southern States would probably have succeeded in their rebellion if they had been geographically divided from the Northern States. One will find the larger combinations existing in the open flat plains; in mountainous regions, or those naturally divided by water, the governing units are smaller. For example, Russia, Germany, China, each with a large area of vast plains, are large in extent. In South America we see the Argentine a huge vast prairie, while on the western slope of the Andes we have a number of small units. India with many mountainous regions has always naturally been partitioned into small units; any unity of the Indian peninsula is entirely artificial; natural divisions are continually disturbed by artificial interferences. In the United

States we see continual antagonism between Western and Eastern interests, but there is no geographical separation; it would be impossible to find where the East left off and the West began, except by drawing an arbitrary line.

Now let us see what geographical conditions exist in the Canadian Confederation. At first glance we see that Western Canada is geographically separate from Eastern Canada. Not indeed by an ocean of water but by a vast wilderness of rocks and desolation. From a geographical standpoint there is no more sense in a union between Alberta and Eastern Canada than there is between Eastern Canada and England. At present there are no marked racial differences, but they will come with time; just as Americans and Canadians have differentiated from the type of their mother-country, and even from one another, so will Western Canadians differentiate from the Easterners. The influence of environment is bound to take effect; and what will suit the one part will disagree with the other.

(3) Identical interests. For stable existence the whole nation must have homogeneity of interests; if various parts have conflicting interests, then in this fact are the seeds of disunion. Of course there are countless examples of parts with conflicting interests remaining parts of the whole, but these cases are owing to the inability of the parts to free themselves. Things being equal, parts having conflicting interests with the whole will break away sooner or later. In olden days identity of religious interests played a most important part; to-day commercial interests hold the greatest sway.

From these facts we may draw some very pertinent conclusions.

Attempts to form vast legislative unions of opposing interests, racial or geographical, can never succeed unless the predominant power has a military force sufficient to coerce the smaller antagonistic fractions.

Further, such a union held together by coercion is bound to be ephemeral unless the teachings of history are gravely at fault.

The true principle that must be embodied

in any constitution undertaking to hold together an aggregate of national units, be they racial or geographical, the true principle is the fullest autonomy for the separate units. True, such a policy is destructive of some cherished beliefs as to what union means, but it alone entails the least amount of tyranny with the advantages accruing from union. The principle is at work in the British Empire; this same principle should be at work in the Canadian Confederation. But no; separate geographical units, regarded as colonies, are denied the most elementary rights of autonomy; it is a dangerous policy; grievances after a time engender bitterness and hatred, and results follow which could have been avoided by a timely prudence.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TARIFF

THE self-evident injustice under which Alberta labours consists of being deprived of her natural resources when all the other provinces own their own resources.

If an abuse is not rectified, in the struggle to remedy the evil other abuses are frequently brought to light, and where the original intention was to effect only specific changes, the questions at issue become gradually enlarged till results are brought to pass never dreamt of by the pioneer malcontents. When Luther first attacked the abuses existing in the Papal administration, he had no idea of creating a perpetual schism; but the dispute widened, and becoming more and more intense reconciliation became impossible. It was the same in the case of the Civil War against Charles I.; a movement, started to redress certain special

grievances, expanded into a rebellion against the entire existing regime. Wesley, when he first started his ministry, was absolutely opposed to secession from the Church of England, but the movement once started could not be controlled, and a schism resulted. Consequently it is always a dangerous policy to allow grievances to become intensified for fear lest the movement, arising owing to their existence, may grow too large to be restrained.

Should justice be denied to Alberta, should an organised agitation come into being, it is hardly likely but that the ill-will, necessarily engendered, would broaden the issues and include many matters foreign to the original demands.

In this chapter we will deal with the subject of the tariff, and endeavour to point out the sacrifice of local interests to Eastern interests entailed by the continuance of a protective tariff.

At present the West merely urges a reduction of the tariff as a measure of general policy; if the West is forced to oppose the

East in order to obtain the same powers of local autonomy as are enjoyed by the Eastern provinces, the tariff question might very easily become a point at issue, and where to-day the West asks for a change in the tariff, she might be led into saying, " We are going to have a different tariff, and if that does not please you the world is large enough for us both; you attend to your business and we will to ours."

The tariff is a hardship to the West; it is a burden inflicted for the benefit of Eastern Canada, and if the West is expected to bear it patiently, the East should refrain from interfering in other concerns of purely local interest. An analysis of this tariff question reveals the startling fact that Canada is treating the West in a manner which, when exercised by Portugal and Spain, was regarded as intolerable tyranny.

Those countries regarded their colonies as markets for their goods, and they claimed the right of framing colonial tariffs which prohibited the importation of foreign articles, whereas the goods of the mother-country

were allowed in free of duty. The colonies suffered from all the evils of a protective tariff without getting any of its advantages. They were compelled to buy from the mother-country. But in what way was their position different to that of the West?

Canada has a protective tariff; a tariff framed ostensibly to build up Canadian industries. The West is a market for manufactured articles; if she desires to buy her goods from Britain or the States a duty is charged, whereas the goods of the mother-country, *i.e.*, Eastern Canada, are allowed in free. Canada as soon as she had the power taxed British manufactured articles; was it a sign of disloyalty to the Empire? Canada was, as a British colony, an integral part of the British Empire, but she considered she had a right to protect her youthful industries against the established industries of Britain. The West is a Canadian colony, and on the analogy of Canada's treatment of her mother-country it is no more incompatible with loyalty to Confederation to have a tariff to suit Western needs than

it was considered incompatible with Canada's loyalty to the Empire to have a tariff to suit her needs.

But, it is argued, Canada is a separate country to Britain, while Western and Eastern Canada are the same country. We reply that the West is geographically separate from Eastern Canada; in fact it actually costs more to travel from Edmonton to Ottawa than it does from Ottawa to London. If the Hudson's Bay and Lake Superior were joined together the West would be regarded as a separate country; but what difference does it make because rocks instead of water divide the two countries. As a matter of fact Hegel states, "It may be asserted as a fundamental principle that nothing unites so much as water, for countries are nothing else than districts occupied by streams. With the sea this is not less the case, as has been already pointed out. Only mountains separate."

Nature has divided Canada into two distinct parts, the East and the West; and the

present tariff makes the West a private preserve for exploitation by Eastern manufacturers. The West is humbly putting up with a system of exploitation which every British colony, and every Spanish colony, rebelled against years ago. They are hoodwinked because they innocently believe they are partners. Being allowed to send representatives to Ottawa causes them to imagine they are governing themselves. To keep them in good humour the East prophesies that the West will one day predominate at Ottawa; should that day come, and should the West introduce legislation benefiting Western interests but disadvantageous to Eastern interests, be assured then that the East will abandon Confederation. Anyway, it is not to be desired that the West should dominate and tyrannize over the East any more than it is right for the East to tyrannize over the West as she is doing at present.

To the Western purchaser it is a matter of complete indifference whether his goods are manufactured in Eastern Canada, Britain

or the States. With so many immigrants from all these countries any sentiment which might exist in favour of some special country is probably equally divided.

The tariff as a protection to Western industries is of no account; Western industries will grow owing to natural advantages: illimitable areas of coal, immense water powers, and nearness to a large consuming market. The present tariff acts as a handicap to the establishment of industries owing to the high scale of wages due to the artificial increase in prices of necessaries caused by the tariff. Thus if wage-earners are compelled to pay high prices for clothing, household utensils, furniture, etc., his wages must be correspondingly higher and a hindrance is thus artificially created to the development of industries adapted to the country through the presence of raw material and cheap power.

The West objects to a high tariff; it is not desirous of establishing a tariff against the East, but as far as the West is concerned, if Free Trade exists with the East it might just

as well exist with the rest of the world. There is no sentiment in trade; it is always a debatable point as to the benefits derived from Free Trade or Protection. At present the West has neither; her industries are not protected, and at the same time she has none of the benefits of Free Trade. With a tariff of her own a large revenue would be raised with a very low tariff because all Eastern goods would be compelled to pay; and if there is to be a tariff, as far as the West is concerned Eastern goods should pay duty just the same as goods from Britain or the States. The East is not a great purchaser of Western produce; the larger share goes to Britain, and it would seem a sound principle to open your markets on equal terms to those on whom you depend to buy your produce.

Where is the revenue to be obtained from? The West with a tariff of her own would not require more than a nominal duty to obtain very handsome returns if all goods from outside points paid duty. Last year $7,250,000 of duty was collected in the

three prairie provinces, and $5,750,000 in British Columbia. This does not include all such merchandise as would pay at Eastern ports and be re-shipped to the West. If the exact figure could be obtained, the amount donated by the West would be found to be out of all proportion to her share.

An illustration of similar conditions is seen in the United States. There the Western and Southern States pay huge indirect taxes for the benefit of the Eastern manufacturing centres. Discontent and complaints are unheeded; Congress is controlled by the East, and persistently refuses to lower the tariff. The same fate may befall Western Canada, but there is one point of difference which lends a glimmer of hope to those who have the interests of Western Canada at heart. The Western States are not geographically separate from the Eastern States; a traveller insensibly passes from the East to the West, and any division would have to be arbitrary. Western Canada is geographically separate from

Eastern Canada; there is no need to apologise for reiterating this essential truth.

In a previous chapter we came to the conclusion that racial or geographical conditions formed a sound scientific basis for division of countries into units. It would puzzle one to judge where to divide the United States: far different is the case of Canada; a line from Port Arthur to the Hudson's Bay is a natural division. Whether in spite of this natural geographical division Western Canada will always remain as docile and long-suffering under Eastern tyranny the future alone can tell. For a while the lack of a national Western spirit will more than offset that antagonism which must occur from the interference and domination of a country geographically separate.

The extraordinary development in the worship of law caused by the industrial spirit will also militate against the secession of the West; but with the gradual growth of Western national spirit, which time will surely bring, it will need statesmen indeed

to adjust the conflicting interests of the East and the West.

To a student who can appreciate the lessons to be drawn from the philosophical study of history, intense interest will attach to the outcome of a policy similar in all essentials, though disguised in outward appearance, to that pursued by Britain and Spain before the principle of colonial self-government was admitted. Hitherto no colony of the Anglo-Saxon race has rested content in being made subordinate and subservient to the interests of the mother-country. It remains to be seen whether Western Canadians have lost the spirit of their fathers. In these days when State interference with individual liberty of action is becoming more and more pronounced, we may be tending to acquire the mental characteristics of the Orientals who bend their patient backs beneath a Government's tyranny with a proper self-effacement and equanimity.

CHAPTER IX

FINANCIAL POSITION OF ALBERTA

THE fundamental principle that all taxes collected in Canada should be spent in Canada was very early admitted by Britain. Their officials continued to have the control of the expenditure, but that Canadian taxes were spent to develop some English port or industry cannot be included amongst the shortcomings of British colonial policy. No such principle of justice is admitted at Ottawa, except possibly in a very loose way. To a certain extent the prosperity of any country is dependent upon the prosperity of other countries; the development of the East is of importance to the West, but at the same time the development of Britain was of importance to the East; however, each country must undertake to shoulder their own burdens, and Western

Revenue should be spent for Western development in the same way as Canadian Revenue has been spent for Canadian development. The prosperity of Canada is rightly considered as being advantageous to Britain as well as to Canada; just so the prosperity of the West is advantageous to the East as well as to herself. The West, in order to be able properly to develop her own resources, must have local control of her own revenues, but this is what is denied to her by Ottawa. The presence of those representatives of the West is considered to be a sovereign remedy against the possibility of any grievance. When the money collected from the natural resources of Alberta is spent, those seven representatives vote. That is supposed to prevent the existence of a constitutional grievance, and that Alberta should have the slightest objection comes as a very painful surprise to those two hundred Eastern members who take upon themselves the burden of spending Alberta's money. If Alberta only knew it, those seven representatives are very expensive.

For no other possible excuse exists for the revenue collected in Alberta being spent in any other place than Alberta.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier is surprised at the obtuseness of British statesmen in objecting to Irish Home Rule. Surely if seven representatives are a sufficient protection to Alberta, eighty-five Irishmen should be sufficient to guard the interests of Ireland. Ireland has eighty-five Nationalists, exclusive of the members from Ulster, and these Nationalists vote in a body on Irish questions, but still Sir Wilfrid imagines that they cannot be expected in a house of six hundred members to exercise that influence which should belong to local members who are supposed to know local needs and necessities. Alberta has seven representatives, four of whom usually vote one way, three the opposite. Sir Wilfrid does not seem to entertain the idea that what is applicable to Ireland is equally applicable to Alberta. By the Canada Act of 1791 Britain withdrew her right to taxation in Canada, except for the regulation of com-

merce, but even in that exception it was admitted that the money must be spent in Canada. But these concessions were far from final; the next objection was the irresponsible expenditure of the taxes by the Crown authorities in Canada. As we have previously noticed, the result of the Canada Act was to place all the executive power in the hands of a local oligarchy. This became intolerable, and in 1840 a further change was effected, by which the executive was made responsible to the representatives of the people. The status of Alberta to Canada is analogous to that formally existing between Canada and Britain, with the exception, of course, of those seven representatives. But the principle that the taxes raised from the people of Alberta should be spent in Alberta has never been acknowledged; if that principle was recognised Alberta would then be in the same position as Canada was before the Act of Union in 1840. Her revenues would be spent in the province, which would be a great boon, but the people of the province, saving those

seven representatives, would have no control or voice in their expenditure.

The functions, which were filled by the Family Compact in the case of Canada, in the case of Alberta would be filled by whatever Ottawa clique Eastern Canada might see fit to return to power. The Family Compact was composed of Canadians, all of them living and born in the country; but that fact did not render them popular, nor did it render the evil of the system less abhorrent. The position of Minister of the Interior is now recognised as belonging to a Western member, but that does not make it any pleasanter for Alberta to see her monies and her resources spent and managed by a small oligarchy in whose appointment she has just seven says. Canada was charged nothing by Britain for the protection afforded by her Army and Navy; Alberta, in return for the privilege of her seven members, could not object to pay her fair share towards Canada's army and navy, and other matters of purely general concern. This share undoubtedly is far exceeded by

Alberta's contributions through indirect taxation. Last year the amount obtained by the tariff was, roughly, $60,000,000; at this figure Alberta contributed $10 *per capita*, providing the average was the same all over Canada: but it is almost a certainty that in a new province such as Alberta, where all manufactured articles have to be imported, the *per capita* average is far higher than the common average. It must be borne in mind, of course, that the duty collected in Ontario on parts of a self-binder or other machinery which is afterwards shipped and sold to Alberta is a tax paid by Alberta. Consequently we find that Alberta contributes through the tariff alone probably at least $4,000,000, of which she receives as a provincial subsidy the sum of $392,693.

The other two items in the provincial subsidy, $375,700 for lands and $405,375 in lieu of the debts of the older provinces assumed by the Dominion, cannot be charged against the tariff contribution to the general exchequer. If these facts are correct the difference between $392,693.60 and $4,000,000

ought to be spent in Alberta. Outside of the National Transcontinental it is very hard to find any large sums spent by Ottawa in Alberta; and in the case of the National Transcontinental Alberta could not be chargeable with the Eastern portion of the line, but only on the portion west to the Pacific.

For the year 1911 the estimated revenue raised by the local parliament of Alberta is about exactly $2,000,000, exclusive of Dominion subsidies, but including payment on account of school lands.

This is the total amount of local revenues the province is allowed to collect; and it has to be collected by hook or by crook so to speak.

Out of an approximate gross aggregate of taxation collected in the province of $7,000,000 the province has only the spending of $3,000,000, and can only dictate as to the form of taxation in the matter of $2,000,000.

This is contrary to every principle of local autonomy, but, and this is not a joke, it is supposed to be perfectly correct and in order,

because Alberta has seven representatives at Ottawa.

A glance at the financial statement of the province for 1911 will show conclusively that unless some radical change is made only direct taxation will save the province from the Bankruptcy Court.

The estimated expenditure for 1911 is $5,902,028.80, and of this sum $2,483,958.00 is charged to capital, and the balance, $3,418,070.80 charged to general revenue.

The general revenue for 1911 is $3,140,923.11, leaving a deficit of $277,147.68, and probably it will be larger.

These figures refer to the actual estimated general revenue expected to be raised in 1911, and to those expenditures charged to the general revenue of 1911.

The item $305,820.68, the balance from 1910, was not included in the revenue for 1911. As, according to the figures for 1910, there was a deficit in the general revenue account of $893,524.28, this surplus must evidently be capital, and cannot rightly be included in the revenue expected to be

collected in 1911. The deficit of $277,147.68 is the difference between what the province intends to spend in 1911 and the actual revenue she expects to collect. In 1910 there was a deficit of $893,524.28; in 1911 there is an estimated deficit of $277,147.68.

These deficits are not admitted by the Government; as a matter of fact they claim a surplus both in 1910 and 1911. This conjuring trick is performed by including in their revenue receipts the proceeds of a loan amounting to $7,400,000. Such a system of book-keeping is evidently meant to mislead the public.

This loan must be regarded as capital, and cannot be included in the revenue receipts.

The financial statement should have read as follows: " In the year 1910 our financial statement shows a deficit of $893,524.28, and in 1911 we estimate that the deficit will amount to $277,147.68. The Government proposes to meet these deficits by a loan of $7,400,000, the balance of which, after

meeting the deficits, will be used in capital expenditure."

Such a statement as the above would have been honest; for what Chancellor of an Exchequer would admit a deficit if he could increase his revenue by loans and claim a surplus!

In any well-conducted business the year's income should cover the year's expenditure, unless unforeseen circumstances arise. In Alberta's budget for 1911 every item which could be possibly charged to capital was so charged, and yet there is a deficit of $277,147.68.

In the expenditure for 1911 there are no signs of extravagance and no items of any size varying from the usual routine. When these estimates were passed the opposition proper (and the opposition improper!) were keenly on the alert for an opportunity to inveigh against extravagance. There were some objections to certain items of capital account, but as far as the general expenditures went, the keenest criticism arose from what was considered the

paltry amount allowed for expenditure on roads.

What then must we gather from these facts?

Simply that Alberta cannot live within her income. She is only managing to pay her way by borrowing without any idea of how she is going to pay back. She has borrowed $9,400,000, and at the end of this year will have a balance on hand of $700,000 barring unforeseen accidents. Most of this borrowed money has gone into public buildings, excepting about $3,500,000 expended in telephone construction.

No sinking fund is provided, and not even can the general expenditure be met by general revenue. If there was no likelihood of demands for further capital expenditure, the prospect might not be so gloomy. If the whole of Canada had been suffering from commercial depression during the last few years we might expect the provincial Government would encounter financial difficulties; but such is not the case; the province, in common with the rest of the

Dominion has enjoyed exceptional and unparalleled prosperity. Not only that but up to the present the Government has had to deal with the easiest portion of the province. The present area of settlement largely covers the prairie portions of the province, where the work of building roads is child's play compared with the rougher portions as yet untouched. That the demands on the provincial purse will increase rather than decrease is what we may expect. If Alberta were similarly situated as such colonies whose early pioneer years entailed poverty, toil and misfortunes, difficulties at the start might be expected, and we might look to the future for brighter and happier times. But no such condition of affairs exists; Alberta is prosperous, her people are making money, trade and business flourish, new industrial and commercial enterprises are continually being inaugurated. Neither can it be charged that the people refuse to bear the necessary burden of taxation; they are taxed, and taxed heavily, but the money goes to Ottawa, there to

be spent regardless of local needs and necessities.

Meanwhile, as a contrast to the discouraging deficits from which Alberta cannot escape, Ottawa rejoices in flourishing and overflowing budgets. Alberta is unable to meet her own ordinary requirements, not because she is a province poor in natural resources or peopled by a lazy and shiftless population, but because the revenues raised locally are commandeered by Ottawa.

Such a condition of affairs would not be tolerated if the citizens of Alberta could recognise their geographical separation from Canada. To the ordinary intelligence there is a difficulty in grasping this important truth, because rocks instead of water form the barrier. Division by water is self-evident at a glance; such other divisions as may be caused by mountains, wildernesses or deserts are disregarded owing to that general lack of careful analysis. Such a mistake still more easily occurs when a railroad connects two geographically distinct countries. There is no essential difference

between a railroad and steamship service. Transportation by railroad is faster, though not invariably, than water transportation, but it is far more expensive. The railroad has to construct and maintain an artificial right-of-way; a steamship service has no such expense or necessity, but can travel in any direction as may be desired. It cannot but be deplored that popular imagination is so easily deluded by superficial appearances, and that as a result conditions arise which if seen in their nakedness would not last a moment. However, in a province of such varied and wonderful resources there may yet arise a national feeling that will insist upon obtaining that amount of local autonomy due to any large individual geographical unit.

CHAPTER X

LANDS AS A NEEDED SOURCE OF REVENUE

THE state of the financial position of Alberta as revealed by the last chapter is not cheering. Evidently the sources of revenue permitted to Alberta by her existing constitution are too limited and prescribed. An ideal revenue should possess great elasticity. A third or more of Alberta's revenue is a fixed subsidy, growing, it is true, to a certain extent till a given limit of population is reached, but otherwise possessing no power of expansion or contraction. The balance of her revenues are principally made up by an aggregation of small fees. The largest single item amounting to $300,000 is returned from the general receipts of the Land Title Offices. This very item was one which came in for severe

criticism on the grounds that the scale of fees is inordinately high, and there seems no doubt this criticism was just. But the province must have funds, and until some new financial devices are discovered the most must be made out of existing sources. Possession and administration of the natural resources of the province, it is claimed, would prevent such financial chaos existing as does exist. Among these resources we number public lands, timber, minerals, fisheries, water powers, etc. In this chapter we will confine ourselves to the question of the lands, as there are considerations in their case to be examined which do not appertain to the case of the other resources.

It may be well at the start to make a résumé of the chief reasons put forward in favour of Dominion rather than provincial control.

Alberta a few years ago had a very few settlers; almost the entire population has grown up from the immigration of people from all parts of the world. To each settler

was granted a free farm; by what right do these strangers now claim the ownership of the still immense unsettled areas? The Dominion Government owned these territories; they give away as a free gift 160 acres to all who choose to perform certain duties; the gratitude shown to the Dominion Government by these favoured individuals is a claim that the Dominion should hand over the balance of her possessions.

Such conduct, the Dominion claims, is rank ingratitude and gross presumption.

Again the province receives a subsidy in lieu of her lands. This subsidy, the apologists for Dominion control argue, is a handsome sum, and, as a matter of fact, worth more to the province than actual control of her lands. If the various provinces owned their lands the Dominion Government could not carry on an immigration policy based on free homesteads. Establishment of Provincial Immigration Departments would result in reciprocal depreciation of the advantages existing in each other's provinces, which would affect the general results at-

tained by the present system of a unified Immigration Department.

These lands, it is further urged, were acquired by Canada for the benefit of the whole of Canada, not for the benefit of one portion. They cost Canada actual money; they entailed, as a consequence of their possession, heavy expenditures on railways in order to open up the country; the cost of administration for many years was always in excess of any revenue received. Is it fair, they ask, to expect Canada to surrender control of these territories just so soon as there is a prospect of a return not more than proportionate to the sacrifices incurred in earlier years?

These reasons form a fair summary of the case for Dominion control, and regarded as a phalanx their strength appears irresistible; but when we take them in detail a close analysis will make them appear far less formidable. To arrive at a fair conclusion we must make use of comparisons; knowledge is relative, not absolute. There would be no possibility of determining that a

beggar was ill-dressed unless his attire was compared to that of a wealthy man. A community of dwarfs not having come into contact with taller races would consider some of themselves tall. The village Solomon is regarded as the incarnation of wisdom until there appears on the scene some city Solomon. The thought of a divorce never occurred to Eve because she had no chance of comparing Adam unfavourably with other husbands. Similarly with Alberta; it is impossible to draw conclusions as to the fairness or unfairness of her treatment by the Dominion unless we discover what is understood by fairness or unfairness in cases of a similar analogy. We have determined that the status of Alberta is that of a Canadian colony; therefore it will be permissible to use the knowledge gained from the constitutions of other colonies as a guide to our judgment.

We are first confronted with the argument that the present population of Alberta being chiefly composed of strangers has no right to demand full local autonomy. The

very fact that the Dominion created two provinces with a system of autonomy, although a shockingly mutilated system, was a recognition of a development and growth sufficient to warrant local individuality. Having admitted that there existed a local individuality entitled to develop itself by means of self-government, by what right did the Dominion refuse to hand over certain properties and powers which are part and parcel of a local autonomy?

If the Dominion considered that the population of Alberta, which was at that time about 250,000, was too small to render it expedient to grant a full measure of autonomy, she has evidently forgotten that the population of Ontario when she was created by the Canada Act of 1791 was 100,000, and was only 400,000 when the Union Act of 1840 came into force. So that considering that the population of Alberta is now about 400,000, it is not a good argument to say that the province is not sufficiently settled. No Government is free from liability to err, but local autonomy

means that each unit has the privilege of making its own mistakes. In a sparsely-settled country there certainly exists a danger lest the Government should become controlled by an up-to-date American machine organisation, and then there would be a repetition of graft similar to that suffered by Ontario under the regime of the Family Compact. But this danger is fast vanishing; both here and in the States the people have arisen against the old political system of graft and corruption, and it is very doubtful if a machine organisation could ever be brought to perfection in this country. There are always dangers; but should the province be afraid of assuming her heritage for fear of the dangers attached to its proper administration, she would be in the same position as a man who would refuse a bequest of $100,000 for fear lest it should be stolen.

Section 20 of the Autonomy Act states:

" Inasmuch as the said province will not have the public land as a source of revenue, there shall be paid by Canada to the pro-

vince" certain specified amounts. By the phraseology of this section there is an admission that public lands are justly considered a source of revenue. The payment in lieu of these lands can be construed as an expression of a belief that the Dominion by withholding these lands is depriving the province of one of her assets. If the province has no just claim to these lands, why should a payment be made? It is expressly stated that this payment is made because this source of revenue is withheld, a source of revenue which is possessed by all the older provinces. If the subsidy is purely a generous gift on the part of the Dominion no such definite statement could have been placed in the Act. The wording of Acts, and especially of Acts of the far-reaching importance of one granting a new constitution to a country, is always most carefully considered, and words which have no meaning are not included for appearance's sake. Consequently the Autonomy Act admits the right of the province to the public lands. That right of the province to her own lands

is supposed to be extinguished by the payments made.

The position is this: A has in his possession certain property belonging to B; when B demands his property, A says that he is better able to administer the property, but will give B a certain allowance. A does not concede that B is entitled to the whole revenue raised from his own property, but hands over just enough for B's bare subsistence. B, having no definite legal status, but only a moral right, has to accept what is offered. A set his own price and then claims a bargain was made.

The only way a bargain could have been made was by first handing over the lands to the province and then entering upon negotiations for buying out the interest of the province. When British Columbia handed over to the Dominion certain tracts of land a bargain was made. British Columbia was in possession of the lands; she was under no compulsion to enter into any arrangements unless she considered it to be to her advantage. Alberta, on the

other hand, was never in possession of her lands. Her representatives in old Territorial Assembly at Regina in framing resolutions on this question invariably demanded a transfer of the land to the province. This was an expression of the public opinion of the province as far as it was possible for the province to express one. This definitely-expressed opinion was entirely ignored by the Ottawa authorities, and the exact contrary to the wishes implied in the resolutions forwarded to the Dominion by the Territorial Assembly was done.

Where was the bargain?

The only plea of any account arises from the acceptance of the subsidies by the province after its formation. In a legal sense this acceptance of the price offered by the Dominion might be held as a ratification of the terms; the province should have refused to accept the subsidy and demanded the lands. But while such a course would have been very heroic, its advantages would have been doubtful because there is no actual legal claim to these lands. Nations, the

same as individuals, are compelled to agitate to have their moral rights crystallized into legal rights. Legal rights are frequently most immoral; and so far from it being necessary to possess legal rights in order to have equity on one's side in pressing a claim, it may often be more necessary to destroy legal rights in order to permit justice and equity to reign. Consequently, whatever bearing the acceptance of the subsidy may have had on the actual legal standing of the province, very little heed need be paid to such quibbles. If the province possesses a moral claim, by fighting for her rights constitutionally or unconstitutionally, she will only be following in the footsteps of the noblest examples of both individuals and nations.

CHAPTER XI

SPOLIATION OF WESTERN LANDS BY DOMINION

THE champions of Dominion control of local natural resources versus provincial control justify their position not only by what they call the inalienable property rights of the Dominion in their own lands, but also by asserting that the present arrangement is really advantageous to the province, and that so far as a bargain goes the province actually benefits at the expense of the Dominion.

In short they represent the Dominion as acting in a philanthropic spirit in relieving the province of the care of her resources.

In the annual report of the Department of the interior for 1910, on page 16, we read as follows:

" It may be interesting to note here that

since 1st September 1908, when provision was made for the granting of pre-emptions and purchased homestead entries, and 31st July last, 40,844 pre-emptions, and 2926 purchased homesteads were recorded, which represents a prospective revenue of $21,009,600, exclusive of the interest which will be accruing to the Government during the time that the entrants are earning title to their homesteads."

$21,000,000 since 1st September 1908 will be encouragement to the Dominion to carry on her philanthropic work. This sum is realised from the sale of lands in the three prairie provinces, though the returns for Manitoba are negligible.

During the Fiscal year 1909-10 the amount realised from the sales was $8,872,000, and of this amount Alberta was responsible for, roughly, $3,857,000.

This one item alone is very large, especially when we consider that Alberta's vast hinterland has not yet been touched. The principle that this money ought to be spent where it is raised is partly acknowledged by

the policy of constructing the Hudson's Bay railroad out of these funds. No definite policy has been laid down, but such were the statements issued by Ottawa when they started selling pre-emptions and purchased homesteads. Benevolent despotism sometimes confers great advantages, but a close watch must always be kept in case the despotism becomes pure and simple despotism without the benevolence. $20,000,000 will almost build the Hudson's Bay railroad, and it will be necessary for those seven representatives to be on a continual *qui vive*, so as Alberta may at least know where all her money is spent.

A step will have been gained when it is laid down as an axiom that monies derived from the natural resources of the West must be spent in the West. That was the first step gained in the early history of Canada; after that is taken the next steps may be easier. This sum of $21,000,000 does not belong to the general revenue, but is placed in the consolidated fund. The general revenue received by the department of the

Interior from Western resources is no small sum. The receipts for the last thirty-eight years average $619,000 per annum, and as the cost of administration for many years was very inconsiderable the Dominion cannot be out of pocket to any extent.

Such expenditures as were entailed by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway must not be charged to this account. As a matter of fact, as we shall see later, the West has paid very handsomely in the form of lands for all Western railway constructions. Vast sums have been added to the debt of the Dominion in the construction of the Inter-colonial Railway for the benefit of the maritime provinces, in the construction of the Grand Trunk and other railroads in Quebec and Ontario, and in the construction of canals and docks. These facts are often forgotten when the West is supposed to be under such deep obligations to the East on account of the national assistance given to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It cost Great Britain $1000,000,000 to conquer the Transvaal; this money will not be

paid back to her by the Transvaal. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway preserved British Columbia and the prairie provinces to the Dominion, so that the price paid was not excessively high. Canada has preserved a wonderful heritage; it would be a fatal mistake to endanger the continuance of amicable relations owing to a parsimonious policy which ever harps upon what the West has cost Canada. From this narrow spirit has sprung the policy of refusing to recognise the Western provinces as real partners in confederation, or to trust them with the control of their natural resources.

In order to lessen somewhat any sense of obligation which may be considered due to Canada's fostering care of the West, the system of assisting railroads by means of land grants will be worth an examination.

Railways have been granted 31,864,074 acres of Western land.

They have sold 14,414,048 acres, netting the sum of $68,570,097.

The average price has been continually

advancing, till last year it stood at $13.36 per acre.

The railways have a balance on hand of 17,450,026 acres. This will yield, at an average price of $10 per acre (which is $3.36 below last year's average price), the handsome return of $170,450,026.

The mileage in the West totals less than 10,000 miles, so that the returns from the sales of land will amount to at least $23,900 per mile! In the light of these facts the stewardship exercised by Canada over these lands does not display a very high order of statesmanship. It is not necessary to condemn too harshly such actions; the faults are committed and past, but these facts do absolve the West from feeling constrained to regard itself as under a debt of perpetual gratitude to the East. Land grants may have been necessary, but some provisions protecting posterity might have been included. An instance of the inane system of making grants is exemplified by the case of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Co. They were granted

over 1,000,000 acres of land for construction of a line from Regina to Prince Albert. Not the slightest provision was made that the receipts from the land sales should be expended on railway construction. The line was built almost entirely by sale of bonds and lands went into the pockets of the promoters. The line was never cared for, and was always in a shocking state until it was purchased by the Canadian Northern Railway. If lands are given away for a specific purpose it would seem a logical principle to legislate that the proceeds should be used for that purpose and not just for the personal use of individuals.

From the experience of the Western States of America, which was well known at the time of these land grants, some degree of caution and care in protecting the interests of posterity might have been expected, but not the slightest attempt was made in any one particular. Such conduct may probably be ascribed to the remoteness of the lands they were so lavishly bestowing; additional proof that the administration at

a distance is not satisfactory, but that local matters must be settled by local governments.

There is another matter entitled to careful consideration. Why should the West bear the whole burden of rewarding the South African veterans?

Canada took part in the war, and on the return of her soldiers was desirous of showing her appreciation of their military spirit. This policy was perfectly just and laudable, and one followed by the most ancient military empires and republics. One would have imagined that there would have been a spirited competition amongst the provinces to obtain their share in the honour and glory of rewarding national warriors. But if there was a rivalry, great credit is due to Alberta's seven representatives as Alberta and Saskatchewan obtained the entire honour of paying for their rewards, and the other provinces must have felt aggrieved at being unable to give vent to their generosity.

Possibly it may have been a touching example of the older provinces sacrificing

their feelings in order to please their little sisters.

However, for our part we disapprove of such friendly rivalry and consider that the national duty of rewarding valour should be borne by the nation as a whole. The burden should have fallen on the general revenue of Canada, not on the private resources of Saskatchewan and Alberta. At present a little over 3000 military scrip are located, representing about 1,000,000 acres of land.

There have been issued 7000 scrip in all, representing 2,240,000 acres of land.

The market price of scrip has been $700; at this price the West has already donated $2,100,000 towards the expenses of the war. If the balance of the scrip is located she will have donated $5,000,000, taking the market price of scrip at $700, or about $2.20 per acre. This is rather a large sum to expect the two newest provinces in the Dominion to contribute to the South African War. Because lands are given does not destroy the fact that the West pays. If the West had had the administration of her lands she

might have pursued the same policy, but that would have been her own business, while it is not the duty of a trustee to throw away the property of his ward. The total cost of the war to Canada was $2,000,000, and it has already cost the West $2,000,000, and will cost two or three more as rewards.

We humbly suggest that when the cost of rewarding returned soldiers exceeds the total cost of the war a nation makes itself ridiculous. To give away the land of a conquered enemy to soldiers seems reasonable, but to give away the lands of your friends seems hardly just!

Some apologists for this spoliation of Western property urge that no harm is done as settlement duties are attached and settlers are wanted. But if that is the case, scrip could have been issued by the Government and put up at auction with a reserve price like school lands. If it is a good policy to issue scrip so as to encourage settlement, issue it by all means, but it can be sold; it has a market price, and presumably people would buy as willingly from the Govern-

ment as from a veteran. There is a slight tendency on the part of the Ottawa Government to recognise the principle that proceeds of Western lands must be spent in the West; the alienation of 2,000,000 acres for other than a purely provincial purpose is a gross violation of that principle. The West is willing to pay her share towards schemes or policies affecting the whole of Canada, but she can rightly object to being saddled with the whole expense. Should a naval war occur, probably the balance of the West would be given away! Rightly or wrongly there is a suspicion abroad that the present Minister of the Interior was never very enthusiastic in this matter of military scrip, which, if true, goes to show how our Western representative is compelled to yield to the opinions of his Eastern colleagues in matters solely concerning the West. The Western lands, if wisely administered, compose a wonderful heritage. In no time in the history of the world was land-hunger becoming so acute, and the immigration into the West is bound to increase with rapid strides. The

welfare and prosperity of these settlers will largely depend on such assistance from the province in building roads and bridges to markets as is necessary in opening a country. As the province grows the burdens will increase. To meet these burdens the present financial arrangements are inadequate; the remedy is provincial ownership of natural resources. In demanding the transfer of her lands Alberta is only asking to be placed upon the same footing as the older provinces. If Canada had a right to her lands when she was a colony under Britain, Alberta has a similar right to her lands though she is but a colony under Canada. Administration at a distance is always unsatisfactory and needlessly expensive. From either point of view, whether it be of expediency or of morality, we are bound to conclude that there is no good reason why the province of Alberta should be deprived of her lands.

CHAPTER XII

IMMIGRATION

IMMIGRATION is a matter closely connected with the ownership of the lands, and constitutes one of the stock arguments of those in favour of Dominion ownership of provincial lands. Provincial ownership of lands, it is asserted, would necessitate the discontinuance of a Dominion Immigration Department, while a substitution of competitive provincial departments would fail in giving good results besides entailing far heavier expenditures.

In answer to this we must note the fact that the Dominion's department of immigration advertises the East as well as the West; that is to say, the Eastern provinces get the benefit of the efforts of the department although they own their own lands. If the department of immigration is carried on only

on account of the Dominion ownership of Western lands, then the department should devote its attention exclusively to the West, which is not the case.

The Eastern members are very jealous in demanding that their provinces should be equally advertised with the West. Ontario undertakes a certain amount of immigration work on her own account, but this is also the case with Alberta. For the last two years Alberta has found it necessary to supplement the work of the Dominion by the establishment of a provincial bureau of immigration.

Provincial ownership of lands does not necessarily entail a cessation of the Dominion's immigration work; we have already noticed that every settler through indirect taxation pays more to the Dominion exchequer than to the local government, so that there will still remain the incentive of gain to keep alive the enthusiasm of the Dominion. We might also note again the contradiction we are met with when on the one hand we are told that provincial owner-

ship of lands means discontinuance of the Dominion Immigration Department, and on the other hand it is stated, with due solemnity, that the Dominion has no desire to make a profit out of Western lands.

That the ownership of her lands carries with it obligations to other countries we do not deny. Vacant lands become of concern to any country whose population has reached its means of subsistence. Pressure of population in older countries compels vast numbers to emigrate, and the unsettled portions of the world are the logical destination of those who have been crowded out.

Land is limited in extent, whereas population is limited only by the supply of the necessaries of life obtained from the land.

The immigration policy is of far-reaching importance, as bearing not only on the present relations with other countries, but also on the future welfare of the race.

In theory countries have the right to exclude the entrance of foreigners. This right is practised to a limited extent by

the establishment of regulations excluding certain classes of would-be immigrants, but a policy of total exclusion could not be put in force except by a country powerful enough to defy the rest of the world.

China, objecting to foreigners, was compelled by force to allow them admittance, though in her case entry was demanded for purposes of trade, not as an outlet for surplus population.

Pressure of population was undoubtedly the unconscious factor at work causing those vast Asiatic migrations which successively devastated the Roman Empire. Pressure of population arises when the existing modes of subsistence have reached their limit of expansion; a pastoral community would outgrow a country's capacity for subsistence long before an agricultural community would in the same country. The pastoral community upon outgrowing its country's resources could become agricultural, thereby relieving the pressure. An agricultural community in the same conditions could resort to intensive agriculture,

which would bring temporary relief. But when such conditions arise emigration offers an alternative remedy. The Asiatic hordes preferred migrating to changing their habits, and emigration still remains the commonest expedient for remedying the evils of a surplus population.

Malthus teaches us that surplus population tends to cure itself by its necessary concomitants of famine, disease and vice. But a country must have become decadent before it would consciously submit to the Malthusian remedies, and virile nations grapple with the problem of pressure of population by emigrating. A vast number of Germans emigrate, and almost exclusively to foreign lands. If they were not allowed admission the Germans would either have to depend upon the workings of Malthus's laws, or they would be compelled to fight for some additional territory.

Such a cause constitutes to our mind one of the few possible moral justifications for war; land is as essential to life as air, and we can hardly imagine one nation

peacefully acquiescing in another nation's monopolising air.

Vacant lands must be regarded as held in trust; they do not belong to Canada, nor do they belong to Alberta. When Britain surrendered these lands to Canada it was never imagined that Britishers might be excluded, and yet theoretically Canada has the right to exclude them. In the same way, if Canada surrendered these lands to Alberta she would undoubtedly be within her rights in expecting that the land policy pursued by Alberta should not inflict a hardship upon her citizens. Britain took an interest in the regulations respecting immigration lately passed by the Dominion; those regulations affected British immigration, but were represented as being in the interests of the immigrant as well as for the benefit of Canada.

While recognising these inter-dependent interests the immigration question is further involved by the race problem. Admission of foreigners of the same colour with whom assimilation insensibly takes place is pro-

bably more of an actual advantage than evil. Admission of coloured people, yellow or black, constitutes a possible menace to the supremacy of the white race, and can rightly be objected to under the law of self-preservation. Here again we see the disadvantages of control by a distant country. British Columbia resented Oriental immigration, but the authorities at Ottawa were not at all in sympathy and disallowed British Columbia's exclusion laws. When the discontent became dangerous Ottawa did finally take some steps to remedy the evil. In Alberta there is a considerable negro immigration; such an immigration is particularly undesirable, but it is a matter of unconcern to the Dominion Government. The Government of Alberta undertook to open up the northern portion of the province by assisting the construction of a railway; every citizen of Alberta has to assist in meeting the liabilities thereby incurred. By the land regulations of the Dominion half at least of the citizens of Alberta are allowed no legal rights in these lands which the

province opens up; negroes are given the lands while Albertans are denied. We have no special objection to negroes, but we hold that they can live and breed in tropical countries where the white race cannot thrive, and that is where they should go. It is unfair that Alberta should undertake the burden of developing a country and then have no say in the regulations respecting settlement. To the argument that Alberta should not undertake to develop her north country we reply that no Government worth its salt could sit idly by and leave half of its territories undeveloped.

The local legislature must feel concern in developing every inch of Albertan territory. The province considers her assembly to be at least an embryo Parliament; the Dominion seems to regard it as a sort of "glorified county council."

In conclusion we cannot admit that the immigration problem affords any tangible argument against provincial ownership of lands. Whether Canada or the province conducts the immigration work, questions

will arise affecting their mutual interests and the interests of other countries.

Disputes would have to be settled by arbitration or friendly conferences. At present the province is not considered as entitled to an opinion on these subjects of immigration and regulations *re* the settlement of public lands. Unless the province abandons all thought of undertaking the development of her hinterlands, the present unsatisfactory arrangements cannot be permitted to continue. We cannot doubt the final result when it means to the province a choice between independent manhood or perpetual childhood.

CHAPTER XIII

ALBERTA'S COAL AND TIMBER RESOURCES

THAT the province should administer her coal, her timber areas, her fisheries and water powers is a more integral part of any system of local autonomy than even the ownership of lands.

Vacant lands, as noticed in the preceding chapter, are to a certain extent of general concern, but the coal, the timber, the fisheries, the water powers are clearly matters of purely local concern. The settlers in a country make their livelihood from the development of these resources, and depend upon them for being able to remain in the country. While any surplus production may be exported, yet before that occurs the home demand has to be supplied. Coal is needed for heating their homes, timber necessary for building their

homes; fish an excellent form of diet; the water powers are evidently of no use except for local purposes. The coal, timber, etc., belong to the people on the lands. Ontario may be interested in her sons being allowed to settle wild lands, but she certainly has no interest in the coal and timber of Alberta. The people chiefly interested are those on the ground, and being chiefly interested they must be expected, if allowed to administer these resources, to follow a policy the most conducive to their best interests. We admit that Saskatchewan is interested in the coal-fields of Alberta, as at present she depends upon Alberta's coal supply, but the division between Saskatchewan and Alberta is an arbitrary, not a geographical division; they are geographically united, while divided for purposes of political administration, and any danger of antagonism between Alberta and Saskatchewan is inconceivable as antagonism arises owing to geographical or racial separation, and these provinces are geographically and racially one.

The coal and timber of the older provinces

belong to, and are administered by their local governments, which fact alone constitutes a good reason why Alberta should possess her coal and timber. Water powers belong to the Dominion throughout Canada, but that does not alter the soundness of the arguments for local control. Water power can only be carried a limited distance; consequently it is essentially a purely local concern.

The disposition of the water power generated by the Niagara Falls concerns only the province of Ontario, just as power generated on the Athabasca river affects only the province of Alberta. Provincial control of water powers is most essential because members who live hundreds of miles away are bound to be indifferent to what happens to some unknown water power. They have worries of their own, and are never anxious to waste their energies in mixing up in other people's business. It is the same old story; the absurdity of the British Parliament considering itself competent to legislate on Canadian or Australian matters has long

been recognised; the majority of the members at Ottawa are equally incompetent to legislate for what are solely Albertan interests. It is only in the last few years that water power has come into prominence, but to-day franchises over water powers are eagerly sought for, and it should be a matter for the province to decide as to how they should be administered. If the older provinces do not possess their water powers they should join in asking for them; for now that the House of Commons at Ottawa has the additional care of the navy, they should be spared all the unnecessary labour attached to purely local matters.

The fisheries of Alberta are of purely local concern, and being lake fisheries, which are easily depleted, they entail the most careful management, which can rarely be successfully given by a department in charge at a distance of 2000 miles. Whether the province would gain financially by their administration is a question, but if Alberta possessed her other resources the care of her fisheries would be a provincial duty whether

carried on at a profit or a loss. Protection of fish where they exist, introduction of fish where they do not but might exist, establishment of proper hatcheries, and destruction, where possible, of inferior kinds of fish in order to assist the increase of those kinds of greater commercial value, are all questions of the greatest moment, and need the closest care and attention. The fish of the Northern waters equal in flavour and taste any in the world; they make not only a variety in the daily diet of the masses but are one of the healthiest of foods. If properly looked after there should be a plentiful and cheap supply of fish for those large cities which are bound to arise in Alberta. The duty of a Government is to endeavour to increase the health and happiness of the governed, and neither of these objects will suffer from cheap and plentiful fish.

The Autonomy Act states that a subsidy is paid because the province will not have the public lands as a source of revenue. That the timber and coal are considered integral parts of the land seems the neces-

sary deduction as otherwise the province receives nothing for her timber and coal. We have already seen that the receipts obtained from the sale of lands are more than adequate to recoup the Dominion, and therefore it seems as though the coal and timber were thrown in for nothing. The returns, however, from these sources are very considerable, and as time goes on will attain to immense proportions. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that Alberta is one vast coal-field; to put into figures the actual computed extent of her coal areas would only bewilder the mind, as figures, when they go into the millions, convey very little meaning to our intelligence. These coal lands are not all subject to uniform regulations. Those lands alienated in early years are free from royalties; at a later date coal lands were sold, subject to a royalty of 10 cents a ton, while to-day coal lands are not sold, but only leased subject to a charge of $1 an acre rental and 5 cents a ton royalty. Some steps should be taken to render the regulations for all coal mines uniform, as the

present patch-work system places some mines at a great disadvantage to others.

For 1909-10 the receipts received from royalties amounted to $155,371.86. Under the rental regulations there were leased 104,799 acres, and the receipts received were $76,491.38. As the rental is a dollar an acre a large balance appears to be in arrears.

The revenue from timber and grazing lands amounted to $69,994.00. These sums form an aggregate of $301,857.24. With the exception of 5000 or 6000 dollars these monies are all paid by Alberta.

The provincial subsidy is $375,000, and the returns from the coal and timber which were incidentally kept by the Dominion total over $300,000.

At the same time, during the year 1909-10 the Dominion received from Alberta an additional $370,000 as payment for coal lands. This sum was not included above because it is a sum which represents capital not revenue. Since 1896 the Dominion has received by sale of coal lands $1,723,648.32.

Some of these returns show considerable

size, but the development of these resources is only just commencing, and in a few years the return from coal royalties alone should be prodigious. Last year Alberta mined about two million tons of coal, and it would be correct to say that the development of the coal industry is hardly started. There are at this present moment two or three lines of railways being specially built to tap new coal-fields, and it is only a matter of time before coal-mining in the province assumes immense proportions. The Provincial Government has to legislate regarding the operations of the mines, and employs inspectors and other officials for their special benefit, but the Dominion gathers in the taxes.

Fouché, upon hearing of the execution of the Duc D'Enghien, is reported to have said, " It is worse than a crime, it is a blunder." The anomaly of the province being responsible for the mining regulations while the Dominion receives the revenues constrains us to imitate Fouché by saying, " It is worse than an injustice, it is an ab-

surdity." The case is similar in the matter of timber berths; there are 1,536,000 acres of timbered lands under licence and permit in Alberta. The Dominion receives a revenue from them, but Alberta receives nothing at all. As far as the revenue of Alberta is concerned they might as well be outside the province. If the Dominion intends to play the part of a speculating capitalist she ought to pay taxes to Alberta; at present all her property is free from taxation, and thus the result is that large tracts of Alberta are non-productive to the revenues of the province, thereby increasing the burdens on other districts.

In the local legislature last year J. K. Cornwall, member for the Peace River constituency, told of the terrible economical waste caused by forest fires. The Dominion Government has mainly relied on Providence to protect Alberta's timber areas. She has consistently pursued a parsimonious policy by which the province has lost millions of dollars' worth of assets. The sooner she abandons her pretensions to the province's

timber the better for all parties; a continuance of her present policy will mean that there will soon be no timber to abandon.

Besides these timber berths there are 1,737,874 acres of grazing land under lease. These are not supposed to be fit for agriculture, but whether they are or not is a question best decided by local experts. These facts all tend to accumulate a mass of evidence that the subsidy granted is out of all proportion to the value of the revenues surrendered. They are revenues which rightfully and constitutionally belong to the province; they are derived from local enterprises which suffer great inconvenience in having the administration carried on at a distance of 2000 miles, and they can be more carefully fostered and better administered under a complete and generous system of local autonomy.

CHAPTER XIV

POSSIBLE WAYS OF OBTAINING REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES

ARE there any means of redress, or are the advocates of provincial ownership merely crying for the moon? Let the provincial parliaments pass as many resolutions as they choose claiming their resources, and they would still be as far off as ever. Ottawa disregarded the resolutions of the old Territorial Assembly, and now she claims a bargain has been ratified she will feel no qualms of conscience in disregarding resolutions emanating from the present provincial assemblies.

There are several courses open to the province; as said above, she can memorialise the Dominion Government and receive by way of reply some gracious and evasive reply. Memorials are rarely effective unless

they are backed up by an evident intention to proceed to further extremities.

If she is desirous of proceeding with greater vigour combined with caution she could very plausibly claim the administration of her timber resources, as timber is not mentioned in the Act; mines and minerals are; but timber, being regarded as inseparable from the surface of the land, is made no mention of. The Dominion is regarded as a private owner of these public lands and claims forests as private property. However, governments possess great latitude in their powers of interference with rights of private property. They do not scruple to order weeds to be cut down on a private man's property, and with that as an analogy they could make regulations with regard to timber. Houses are distinctly private property attached to the land, but they are taxed, and on that analogy private property in the form of forests attached to the land is liable to taxation. Working from this standpoint the province might proceed to pass legislation with regard to administra-

tion of timber limits. Dominion property is exempt from taxation, but it might be reasonably argued that directly the Dominion disposes or leases any property that property can no longer be held as exempt from provincial taxation. In fact, this is the course pursued when school lands are leased; the lessee of a school section has to pay local improvement taxes; similarly all coal or timber disposed of, or leased by the Dominion Government, should be liable to provincial taxation. Coal on lands disposed of prior to 1901 pays no royalty to the Government as the regulations with regard to royalties came into force that year. This exemption has no existence as far as the province is concerned. The Dominion may have sold coal areas absolutely without making provision for royalties, but the Dominion has also sold land absolutely. It would never be contended that therefore the lands could not be taxed. Everything can be taxed, and there is no better source of taxation than the natural resources which are the result of no labour. A small tax,

while in the aggregate producing a large sum, would have very little, if any, effect on the price. Taxes must be borne by the people, but there are certain sources of revenue more economical than others and less burdensome. Taxes on natural resources are equitable, because the resources can be regarded as the common property of everybody. If the tax can be made to fall upon the owners who have been fortunate enough to appropriate these resources, so much the better, but even if they are paid by the consumers it would be a disguised form of taxation both moderate and economical.

The province, desiring to proceed cautiously and constitutionally, might very well enforce some such system of regulation and taxation, which, if objected to by the Dominion, would have to be fought in the Courts.

Sir John M'Donald denied Ontario's claim to certain territories, and the Dominion took possession. Ontario did not submit tamely, but proceeded to administer the

territory at the same time as the Dominion was undertaking to administer it. Dominion officials were arrested by Ontario officials and *vice versa*, and Sir John M'Donald was compelled to change his fiery language and submit to arbitration. After the province was granted the disputed territory Sir John claimed the resources; to quote his own words:

"Even if all the territory Mr Mowat asks for were awarded to Ontario, there is not one stick of timber, one acre of land, or one lump of lead, iron or coal that does not belong to the Dominion Government."

Sir Oliver Mowat was just as determined as Sir John, and the province was adjudged her resources.

Similarly Alberta might find many flaws in the constitutionality of the proceedings of the Dominion. So far, unfortunately, the local governments have felt in duty bound from party ties to shield the Dominion from criticism rather than to resist their encroachments on local autonomy.

It might likewise be argued that the entire

Act is unconstitutional; the Dominion stood in the position of trustee for these lands during their minority. When they were ceded to Canada by Britain it was not intended that a part of the British Empire should be deprived of the rights enjoyed by all other parts and become the handmaiden of a country no better than herself. If these provinces are to be used for purposes of exploitation Britain might as well have exploited them herself. But Britain had passed by that stage of colonial government, and the rights of colonies to self-government to-day forms an integral part of the unwritten constitution affecting British colonies. Alberta has lost this boon because she was handed over in her infancy to a stepmother. To Alberta there belonged a certain heritage acquired and willed to her by her legitimate mother; not only has the heritage been extravagantly wasted during the infancy of Alberta, but even when she has attained her majority the stepmother refuses to hand over to her the remnants of her heritage. Canada as

stepmother has abused the trust confided to her by Britain, and there is no reason why Alberta, as an individual in the British Empire, should not demand the Imperial Parliament to redress her wrongs. Possession by Canada has not obviated the fact that Alberta is a part of the British Empire, and if Canada behaves in a manner irreconcilable with the continuance of good relations with Alberta, it would be perfectly proper for Alberta to claim the right to place herself on an equal footing with Canada and be restored to her pristine position as a daughter of the British Empire.

We have had cause in a former chapter to refer to the similarity of the question of Home Rule for Ireland and Autonomy for Alberta. We have noticed the sympathy continually expressed by Ottawa for unfortunate Ireland. Contributions and oratory have both been lavishly expended in the cause of the distressed island. Expressions of sympathy, and financial contributions even to a greater extent, imply

agreement with the methods employed by those whom we are so desirous of assisting. With this stamp of official approval on such methods, Alberta might copy some of the tactics employed by the Irish.

This would entail a change from the present pacific policy of sending seven representatives—three of whom vote one way, four the opposite—and a compact body would have to be sent, pledged to harass the Central Government on every possible occasion, to expose her perfidious practices, and to cheer any reverses Fate might have in store for her.

In addition the children in our schools would be taught to regard this Canada, this stepmother, as the incarnation of greed, tyranny and oppression, and besides, expeditions might be made to Britain or to the States to raise funds from those in sympathy with an oppressed people.

Such methods as these, approved and encouraged by Sir Wilfrid Laurier when used to remedy the wrongs of an oppressed people, might produce rather serious consequences

in a province so large in area and geographically separate from the Central Government. Canada, herself possessing subject territories, should use caution in encouraging and approving of the aspirations after liberty and freedom of other subject races.

A radical procedure, and rather a practical one in its way, would be to hoist the flag of independence, which would *ipso facto* make the province owner of her own resources. After a banquet or two and patriotic oratory the province might express a desire to be reinstated in the Confederation, and then she would be in a position to make a bargain. This seems the most sensible plan; there is no objection to forming a partnership with the Confederation, but there is an objection to being used as a step-child and deprived of local autonomy. Negotiations would have to precede an invasion; the Saskatchewan river has not been yet deepened sufficiently to permit of that route being used by the navy, and the Dominion would be as much puzzled what course to pursue as the province. Arbitration would have to be

invoked; there is no danger of Britain advising anything but moderation after the lesson of the Boer War. If the province possessed 2500 "*Browns*" instead of blacks there would be no difficulty, and even as it is, once before in the history of Alberta the Dominion was openly defied and submitted. The hero of that occasion still lives, and as history is said to repeat itself, he might be induced to repeat his history on a larger scale. In conclusion, once the province decides that she labours under unjust and inequitable terms, means of redress will be found to hand whether those means conform or not to all the niceties of some deified constitution.

CHAPTER XV

POLITICAL SUMMARY

SOME pains have been taken in previous chapters to present in as clear and plain a manner as possible some of the outstanding features of the financial condition of the province internally and in relation to the Dominion of Canada. Statistics can be twisted to lend support to most extravagant statements. We will notice just one instance, where a deceitful use of figures might have strengthened the provincial case, but such a use was studiously avoided. The provincial subsidy in lieu of lands last year was $375,000, and the Dominion received from the coal and timber lands of the province alone $670,000. Such a statement of figures as the above is verbally true but amounts to a conscious or unconscious lie according to the compiler's understanding. It conveys a wrong impression; the

revenue was $300,000, which may be expected to increase every year; the balance, $370,000, represents capital which would stand for a revenue of, roughly, $15,000 annually, being the interest on the principal. The reader is cautioned against statistics, but some were necessary in a discussion of this kind, and it is sincerely hoped that no mistaken impressions have been produced by a faulty use of statistics.

The financial terms may appear more advantageous to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as they are possessed of less mineral wealth, but as far as Alberta is concerned, if the subsidy is supposed to represent a fair equivalent for the lands, minerals and timber of the province, the men who framed the bill were guilty of the most culpable ignorance, or knowingly and with malicious intent did perpetrate a gigantic steal. There is no other alternative to explain their conduct. As a matter of fact they coveted these lands and local resources, and they could not bring themselves to let them go. They seem to have

acted in a precisely similar manner to that of Ananias; he seems to have known or imagined that he should give his entire wealth to the Church; he was loth to part with it all, and kept back a portion, hoping that what he gave would satisfy the Church authorities. To us in these days his sacrifice of partial wealth seems praiseworthy; doubtless to-day the churches would gladly make a compromise on this basis. But at that time it was not necessary for the Church to condescend to effect a compromise; backed by her miraculous gifts she had the power to punish disobedience or neglect. Canada, too, seems to have recognised that autonomy was due to Alberta, but like Ananias she was loth to hand over all those powers she ought to have handed over, and has hoped that Alberta would be content with a constitution far short of what is meant by local autonomy. Unfortunately Alberta has not the benefit of those miraculous powers of the early Christian Church but must rely upon her own strength of character and purpose.

Sir John M'Donald once coveted the lands, minerals and timber of a portion of the province of Ontario; but Sir John M'Donald was justified in his covetousness because he had always been an ardent supporter of a legislative in place of a federal Union. He had fought at the start against the system of provincial autonomy; he firmly believed that the Confederation would be the stronger and freer from friction if the Central Government administered and controlled every local matter just as the Imperial Parliament controls and administers the local affairs of Scotland and Ireland. In our opinion this policy was wrong and would have been fatal to the success of Confederation, but at least Sir John M'Donald acted in accordance to a certain well-defined policy, *i.e.*, of strengthening the Federal House at the expense of the Provincial Houses. Sir John M'Donald was not successful, and Confederation was based upon the federal and not a legislative principle. In later years, when his Government gave Manitoba a constitution, Sir John was able

to bring into force his leanings in favour of a legislative policy, which forms the basis of the Constitutions of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. He had attempted to steal away the local powers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but had abandoned the idea when it became clear that no Confederation could be formed on a legislative basis. At that time Mr Laurier was a champion of provincial rights. When Sir John M'Donald was engaged in his controversy with Ontario, Mr Laurier courageously took exception to the general opinion of his countrymen, who regarded the aggrandisement of Ontario with disfavour. He supported the claims of Ontario to their lands and resources. Evidently Sir Wilfrid Laurier in his younger days favoured the federal rather than the legislative Union. By the federal system the individuality and supremacy of his own race in Quebec has been preserved intact; are the advantages accruing from the modified federal Constitution adopted in the British North America Act to be reserved for Quebec

and denied to Alberta? Has it been opportunism that has always guided Sir Wilfrid's actions, or why such a reversal of policy when the duty fell to him of dealing with provincial autonomy.

Tempora mutantur!

Between Quebec and Ontario, or Upper and Lower Canada as they were then styled, there existed a racial separation. Legislative Union had been in force since 1840 to 1867, but neither province was at all satisfied, and friction was continuous. Since they have each managed their own local affairs while matters of general concern have been under the supervision of a Central Government, peace and friendliness have taken the place of friction and animosity.

Alberta is not separated racially but geographically from Eastern Canada. She asks that the same treatment, so successfully applied in the case of the older provinces, be accorded to her. Management of her own local affairs and resources, that is what is demanded. Alberta's heritage forms an asset of incalculable value. Ottawa appears

to imagine that it is really too magnificent a patrimony to surrender. Alberta might waste it in riotous living; or she might easily become a prey to unscrupulous grafters. How often do the same feelings occur when a young man leaves his father's house and starts on his career. The old folks can never credit him with due sagacity and caution, and they consume their time in anxiety and dread on his behalf. But we cannot expect the young man to remain for ever tied to his mother's apron-strings; he insensibly feels that he must get out and take his share in the battle of life if he is to develop his nature to its full extent. Alberta fills the same position to Canada as that young man does to his parents. The risks and dangers attending freedom are duly appreciated, but at the same time she feels that she will have lost that sense and pride of manhood should she consent to remain under the everlasting guardianship of her parent. At present Alberta resembles a remittance man. This is rather unfair as most remittance men become so as a result

of a career of frivolity and dissipation. Alberta has never been given the chance to be either frivolous or dissipated.

A typical instance of Ottawa's offensive contempt for Alberta's business ability is seen in her conduct with regard to the school lands. These lands are an endowment of the common schools of Alberta; the revenues arising from them, and the proceeds of their sales, must be spent on provincial education, which is a matter under local control, even according to the present constitution. Alberta has requested Ottawa to relinquish to her the administration of these lands, but Ottawa refuses. There is absolutely no sense or justice in the retention of the administration of these lands by Ottawa. They have been definitely set apart for the purpose of education in Alberta; Ottawa has nothing to do with the educational policy of Alberta, and it is very evident that Alberta is the party chiefly concerned in a careful supervision of these lands. At present six million dollars' worth of school lands have been sold in Alberta,

and every year Ottawa doles out a little allowance to the province, based upon the interest yearly accruing from the monies actually collected. This money belongs to Alberta, and she has the right to say how the principal shall be invested as well as to receive the interest. In course of time this fund will reach very large proportions, and Alberta could doubtless find investment for the money mutually advantageous to the fund and to the development of the province. The retention of these school land monies is so outrageous that the submissiveness hitherto shown by Alberta to Ottawa does not look very encouraging. This leads us to make a few remarks on the party system. A party system, like most other systems, except those supposed to break Monte Carlo, has its good and bad points. In its present form it has not existed for much above eighty years. The real origin of the modern party system may be dated to the year 1835, when the Whig Ministry was summarily dismissed by William IV. and the Tories asked to form a Government.

In their indignation at the action of the King the Whigs determined, and were bent upon destroying the Government, irrespective of the goodness or badness of the measures introduced. Previous to this the House was supposed to support the King's Ministers, and only on grave and important matters where real difference of opinion existed would the Opposition refuse its support to the Government. In 1835 the Whigs were determined to destroy the King's Government, and since that time the coherence and definiteness of party lines has gradually become more and more distinct. In the middle of the last century a Tory Government might, by following a moderate policy, depend upon a large Whig support. Nowadays the object is always to place the Government out of power, and for party advantage national interests are frequently opposed rather than supported. The faults of this extreme party feeling are most apparent in the relations between the provinces and the Dominion.

"You cannot serve two masters" is an

old proverb, and the local politician is continually on the horns of a dilemma betwixt his loyalty to his party or his province. Naturally the opponents of the party in power at Ottawa are always exceptionally jealous of provincial rights; on the other hand, those in sympathy with Ottawa, though perhaps equally believing in local autonomy, yet when they hear the party war-cry raised are no more able to resist joining in the fray against their old-time foes than a terrier can resist chasing a cat. The actions in both cases have grown to be almost instinctive, and while we have seen terriers and cats form a truce, yet the appearance of a strange cat is never tolerated.

Such a state of affairs is much to be deplored, and efforts should be made to mitigate these feelings as much as possible. There is far less of this feeling in the West than there is in the East, owing to the presence of so many strangers ignorant of Canadian politics and consequently lacking any party enthusiasm. The Conservative

party, being opposed to the Ottawa Government, supported local autonomy; on previous occasions their party had been the arch enemy of local autonomy, and to some may have occurred these lines, "*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*" The Liberal party during the present controversy sacrificed provincial interests to what they considered the more important interests of their friends in power at Ottawa. At last, however, they have found it necessary to admit, in a half-hearted manner it is true, the desirability of the province obtaining possession of her local resources. A resolution dealing with the subject was introduced in the Alberta Legislature by two Liberal members, worded as follows:—

"Whereas the development of the north country entails serious financial and other obligations:

"Therefore be it resolved that this House do instruct the Government to take such steps as may be deemed necessary to acquire the control of such natural resources as are of purely local concern, and to enter into

arrangements with regard to the settlement of the vacant lands."

The Premier assured the House of his sympathy with the resolution, and stated that the Government had been negotiating with the Dominion on some such lines. An amendment was finally moved congratulating the Government on having started negotiations and counselling them to continue. This amendment was passed unanimously, and as a commencement in consolidating provincial opinion on this question must be considered very satisfactory.

By this resolution the Liberal party admits—an admission hitherto strenuously opposed—that it would be for the good of the province to have some changes made in her relations to Ottawa. In the debate which took place in the local House great credit is due to the spirit in which the Conservatives received this tardy repentance of the Liberals. It was a grand opportunity to manufacture party capital, but instead they seemed willing to forget their party and rather welcome in a friendly spirit the con-

version of their late enemies to their principles. If both parties will endeavour to keep this question separate from the party arena and not endeavour to make party capital out of it, there may be some hope that a united front will have some effect at Ottawa. If the parties cannot coalesce even in a cause of such vital importance and interest to every citizen of Alberta, the oligarchy at Ottawa may well regard occasional memorials with contempt, and refuse to disgorge the plunder they have stolen and are stealing from the fair province of Alberta.

CHAPTER XVI

PHILOSOPHICAL SUMMARY

IN treating this subject there has been no attempt to disguise either unpleasant facts or disagreeable deductions drawn from historical analogies. No wilful attempt has been made to exaggerate, and in the use of statistics the policy has been to underestimate rather than magnify. Outside of the actual utilitarian point of view there is a strong case for provincial rights based on historical and philosophical grounds. Some philosophers believe in an inherent right and wrong, others regard right and wrong as purely relative and subjective to the prevailing customs and ideas of the people. For individual conduct some maxims of right and wrong are fairly well agreed upon; few would dispute that truth, honesty and

charity are right and their opposites wrong; but we are at a loss when we attempt to settle what is the code of ethics amongst nations. The diplomat distinguishes himself by deceiving his enemies; the powerful nation, most particular in seeking satisfaction from weaker nations, always disregards their claims when adverse to herself. So far as the commercial policies of nations show any tendency, their greatest ambition is to prevent every other nation from playing in their backyard or touching their toys. Professed selfishness is the very keynote of the commercial policy of all nations. Recognising this difficulty, in applying a comparison of the treatment accorded to these provinces with a supposed standard of national ethics, we have satisfied ourselves with making use of the knowledge gained from past colonial histories as affording a clue to the probable results of different lines of policy. If we discover certain results regularly following certain actions, we begin to suspect there is a connection between the action and the result; and while we cannot

expect to attain that degree of certainty which exists in all mechanical sciences, it still remains the only method of avoiding a constant series of similar mistakes. In obedience to this philosophical axiom we hold that any results seemingly common to the histories of a number of different colonies must contain some germ of a philosophical truth, which, if discovered, should be applied to parallel cases occurring in succeeding generations. Likewise there was a need to make it plain what was the real status of the province we were dealing with. Words amount to very little as they so rapidly lose their original meaning. For instance, if King Henry VIII. came back to England he would not regard himself as a king, shorn of all prerogatives as the crown is to-day; for England is a republic disguised as a monarchy, and considering the size of her population she is probably the best example of successful republican institutions in the world. With a due appreciation of these popular fallacies concerning the real classification of forms of self-government we

investigated the political status of these Canadian provinces, and discovered that they resembled colonies, and must be designated as Canadian colonies. Just as England is a disguised monarchy, so were these provinces disguised as free and equal partners in a Confederation of several units. The King of England rejoices in a crown; Alberta rejoices in seven representatives; the King of England's crown does not alter the truth that England is a republic; Alberta's seven representatives do not alter the truth that outsiders manage, control and dispose of the natural resources of Alberta. Representation of Alberta at Ottawa affords the only ground for justification of the treatment accorded Alberta. Upon an examination of the facts we found it to be largely a catch-word, useful at one time to throw off the yoke of a distant country, useful to-day to place under the yoke a distant country. Representation, we found, was so far from being a panacea for all evils that the House of Commons at Ottawa had on two occasions felt compelled to raise a protest on

behalf of a people only too well represented, but in spite of that the victims of an inexorable and insidious tyranny. Such an action does credit to the heart and feelings of those Canadian law-makers, and once they find that they have been misled and betrayed into being guilty and accessory to a similar system of tyranny, of which they have expressed their detestation, we may well believe they will not let the grass grow under their feet before they rise up in their anger and compel justice to be done. Analysis frequently appears cold-blooded; how few loves can stand a cruel and searching analysis. Beauty is supposed to be but skin deep, and a lover would repudiate the idea that he loved his mistress for her beauty alone, and yet should she be suddenly disfigured by some terrible accident he would find his feeling insensibly change.

In our analysis we may have seemed to have overlooked all those ties of sentiment and patriotism which are considered as sufficient to bind the whole of Canada together into one harmonious whole. Per-

fectly true; we have disregarded the existence of such bonds of union because we hold that they are unsubstantial, illusory and erratic. Such ties are too similar to those which bind lovers; they may endure or they may not. Wiseacres shake their heads when witnessing the vows and oaths of lovers; experience has taught them too often what to expect. History may record a few instances of genuine patriotism or gratitude attaching a people to the cause of their mother-country without the extra incentive of policy. Sentiment or bonds of relationship are never trustworthy, and when a cause of dispute arises between people closely related more often than not there is more bad blood engendered, and more lasting ill-will remains than though there was no relationship at all.

We are not urging a secession of the West from the East, but we are endeavouring to show that such a result must ensue unless a change in her system of colonial government is made by Canada. The life-work of Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been to consummate a

Canadian nationality; that is to say, he has aimed to construct a definite and distinct nationality inside of the Empire. In the pursuit of this task he has not been labelled a traitor or a destroyer of the Empire by the Imperial authorities. They realise that the Empire is an association of nations, and that any attempt to stifle the individual nationality of heterogeneous parts would end in disastrous failure. We claim that there is still a further sub-division of control necessary to complete that Imperial scheme of devolution.

We may compare the Empire to the solar system. All the celestial bodies in this system revolve around the sun, but at the same time some of these bodies have likewise satellites of their own revolving around them. Canada is in the position that while she revolves around Great Britain, the centre of the Empire, she too has, or should have, smaller bodies revolving around her. Alberta is only too willing to be one among these smaller bodies, but to become one Canada must relinquish that close super-

vision which prevents poor Alberta from revolving on her own account. The laws of evolution are inexorable, and resistance will only result in a catastrophe. For Alberta, unnaturally and artificially held in bondage, would eventually burst her bonds asunder, and the pent-up and dormant energy which should have been in continual use would then have the effect of throwing Alberta so far from her parent that she would progress beyond the parent's sphere of influence, and consequently cease to gravitate around her. These are the dangers which attend the present selfish and short-sighted policy of the Ottawa Government. They may not appear imminent; dangers rarely do. But our investigation of causes at work lead us to believe that such results are inevitable. We have found that Alberta is treated as a colony although the truth is disguised. We have found that a philosophical excuse for national individuality exists in the fact of her geographical separation from Eastern Canada, and history teaches us that coercion is the only means

of permanently holding in subjection a separate racial or geographical unit.

Is Canada prepared to hold Alberta with or without her will? Does she imagine that she will have the same good fortune as attended the Northern States when they coerced the Southern Confederacy? The cases are very different, though the results would have been the same in both instances if Richmond, like Edmonton, had been separated from Washington by a vast stretch of wilderness.

We have seen that the province of Alberta is not on the same footing in the Canadian Confederation as Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia. Alberta's sources of wealth are looked after for her and she is only allowed so much pocket-money. We have shown that Alberta is geographically as distinct from Eastern Canada as Eastern Canada is from England, and that consequently it follows as a logical sequence that such relations as have been found adapted to exist between Eastern Canada and Britain should form the basis

of the union between Alberta and Canada. As time goes on Alberta's interests will not always be identical with those of Eastern Canada. We have also shown the process by which Eastern Canada obtained her rights to deal independently with her own resources and affairs; these rights were granted in exact proportion to her ability to claim them. Is Alberta always to be in a state of tutelage to the East? Our answer is direct and unhesitating: yes, until she herself insists on equality of rights with the other provinces and shows her determination to attain her proper position relative to her sister provinces.

The advisability of recognising Alberta's constitutional right to be mistress in her own House will become a living force only when Ottawa perceives that Alberta has the ability and the determination to obtain possession of her resources.

CHAPTER XVII

CONCLUSION

WHETHER we have succeeded or not in establishing in the reader's mind a conviction that the present subordination of Alberta to Ottawa domination is inconsistent with good policy, both on grounds of expediency and morality, may depend upon personal prejudices from which it is hardly possible for local participants in a political question to disassociate themselves.

We firmly believe that in spite of the author's shortcomings from the literary point of view, and his rather too evident predilection for straying from the direct path of his investigation into questionable and debatable philosophical speculation, that in spite of these and other failings an impartial stranger will hold that a strong

prima-facie case has been made out that Alberta has suffered, and is suffering, gross injustice at the hands of the Ottawa Government.

We started our inquiry by a definition of Alberta's place in the classification of nations. Wrong conclusions might easily have arisen if we were unaware of the proper rank of the country, the subject of our discussion. It is simple to recognise that Alberta does not rank as an empire, as a kingdom, or as a republic. By a close and searching analysis we discovered that Alberta must be classified as a colony, and as a colony we found that she must be designated a Canadian colony. This was our first step and one of the most paramount importance. It is not a question as to whether Alberta likes to be called a colony or not, but whether she is one really or not; and we were compelled upon comparing her powers and prerogatives with those of other nations to classify her as a colony. We then briefly investigated the histories of colonial communities as bearing on the ques-

tion of the extent of powers properly belonging to nations of this rank.

We noted the difference between the effects of industrial and military ideals on the constitution obtained by their respective subject colonies. Alberta, we held, is a colony of industrial rather than military origin, and may therefore claim that measure of self-government which is more the attribute of industrial as opposed to military colonies. We found that Canada a century ago stood in as analogous a position to Britain as Alberta stands in towards Canada to-day, and from this fact we concluded that such measures of policy as had been found successful in practice as applied to the relations existing between Canada and Britain would be equally conducive to the joint interest of Canada and Alberta, and would be the most in accordance with those principles of local autonomy recognised as the fundamental basis of British colonial institutions. This principle, we learnt, was recognised by Canada to a certain extent when she created Alberta a

province, but this principle was violated when she withheld from this new province powers and properties inherent to legitimate colonial autonomy. Such a violation was excused on the grounds that Alberta was represented in the Dominion House. Upon an examination of this argument we rejected it both as opposed to expediency, as constituting a difference between Alberta and her sister provinces, and as actually being in exact contradiction to the expressed opinion of Ottawa on the similar question of Home Rule in Ireland.

That Alberta was entitled to claim an individuality of her own was justified, we argued, by the philosophical reasons which explain the more active causes at work in dividing the world into specific units for purposes of government.

The geographical separation of Alberta from Canada constitutes the important philosophical truth, making it permissible for Alberta to be possessed of a national aspiration for a local individuality unfettered by outside interference.

There are several causes for complaints which result from the present prescribed powers of the province. Her interests are not identical with those of Canada, and one of the points of acute difference is the question of the tariff. At present Alberta is held as a preserve in which Eastern manufacturers are protected against competition although it is a matter of indifference to Alberta where she buys her goods. This maintenance of a private preserve for the mother-country's merchants is a policy which neither Great Britain nor Spain were able to perpetuate in spite of their natural inclination.

At present, however, the tariff is what we might call a supplementary grievance, not yet seen in its real significance, but containing the germ of disunion should the province be led into a close introspection of her relations with Canada.

The important truth we drew from our glance at the workings of the present tariff arrangements was that Alberta contributes through this channel of taxation every dollar

of her proportionate share towards Dominion expenses; probably, if it was possible to get at the exact figures, it would be discovered that Alberta pays more than her proportionate share, but, content with under-estimating rather than magnifying her grievances, we state without fear of contradiction that the tariff contributions of Alberta are sufficient to defray every charge incurred by Ottawa on her account.

Our course of inquiry then led us to diagnose the financial position of the province of Alberta, and we discovered that her current revenues are not capable of meeting current expenses. This was true in spite of the fact that all sources of taxation have been tapped, in spite of the fact that Canada as a whole has been so prosperous that she is the cynosure of the eyes of the whole world, in spite of the fact that a generous expenditure is charged to a capital account.

Following this startling discovery of Alberta's financial poverty we examined the revenues derived by the Dominion from the administration of the lands, timber,

minerals, etc., of the province of Alberta. We had already seen that Alberta paid her share to the Dominion treasury through indirect taxation, and we laid bare the enormity of a province labouring under deficits while outsiders were squandering her personal wealth. The wealthiest province of the Dominion in natural resources is financially a pauper; this was the picture presented to our eyes when we made use of them and refused to keep them closed to suit party exigencies and manipulation. The revenues derived from Alberta's natural resources are clearly "provincial revenues."

Let us hear what Lord Durham had to say with respect to the expenditure of provincial revenues.

"It was a vain delusion to imagine that, by mere limitations in the Constitutional Act, or an exclusive system of government, a body, strong in the consciousness of wielding the public opinion of the majority, could regard certain portions of the provincial revenues as sacred from its control, etc."

" Sacred from its control "!!

That is the light in which the local legislature of Alberta is asked to view the local revenues derived from her school lands, her public lands, her minerals, her timber, etc.

Canada has been accustomed to regard Lord Durham as the greatest and most enlightened of British colonial statesmen; was his advice merely applicable to a temporary political phenomenon, or does it apply to broad principles of statesmanship which live for more than one passing epoch? Unhesitatingly we accept the latter alternative and consider that any colonial policy to be successful must give the greatest latitude to the free play of local institutions.

During the debate on the Canada Act, Fox spoke as follows: " I am convinced that the only means of retaining distant colonies with advantage is to enable them to govern themselves."

With one qualification we hold this statement to be the correct epitome of colonial policy. We must qualify the statement by holding the maxim applicable only to

colonies peopled with a race equal to that of the mother-country. We do not claim, whatever others may, that all races are equal, and if Alberta is peopled by an inferior race to that of Eastern Canada, we admit Eastern Canada's right to subject Alberta to her interests. But we refuse to admit Alberta's racial inferiority, though, should Alberta continue content with her baby constitution, it may have to be regarded as a proof that Alberta's proper destiny is to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water for others.

We discussed possible means of redress, and we held that means were at hand if the people were willing.

We consider that it is the part of a good citizen of the province of Alberta to work for his country's freedom as much as it is the part of a good citizen of Canada to work for her freedom. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's life-work has been the emancipation of Canada from every jot and tittle of home interference; to our mind Sir Wilfrid Laurier is a Canadian statesman, a good citizen, who

deserves well of his country, and whose name we firmly believe will be handed down by history as Canada's foremost son.

His Canadian patriotism has not been deemed incompatible with devotion to the Empire, and we contend that Albertan patriotism is also not incompatible with an affection for the Confederation.

The Empire is held to be a gainer from Canada's prosperity; Confederation must be held to be a gainer from Alberta's prosperity. The Canadian does his duty to Imperial welfare by devoting himself to the building up of Canada; the Albertan may do his duty to Confederation by confining his energies to the development of Alberta. "Canada first, last and forever" is the motto Sir Wilfrid Laurier has given Canadians without prejudicing their Imperial ties, and no disrespect to Confederation is implied when the citizens of Alberta take for their motto: "Alberta first, last and forever."

THE END

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
W. STEWART & Co.
LONDON, E.C.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

HC
M8198ca

Moore, A Bramley
Canada and her colonies.

596267